

SENATE

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1958

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, like the mystic quiet of April twilight, steal upon us now with a sense of the eternal verities which surround us, as we bring our fainting spirits to the still waters of Thy restoring grace and to the white holiness that shames our uncleanness, to the love that forgives our iniquities, to the truth that defies all our falseness, and to the patience that outlasts all our fickleness. As we seek to mend the flaws and faults of our democracy, make ours a nation that Thou canst speak to and through, to this bewildered generation seeking the path to the peace its willful feet have so sadly missed. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1958, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION OF DULUTH LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from Mrs. C. M. Fredin, second vice president and international chairman for the Duluth League of Women Voters, informing me of their support for the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, preferably extending it for a 5-year period.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS OF DULUTH,
Duluth, Minn., April 17, 1958.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of the League of Women Voters of Duluth wants you to know of our support of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, preferably extending it for a 5-year period. We feel that world trade would be benefited by a narrowing of the escape clause, and by leaving the final escape-clause decisions in Presidential hands.

The board also favors the establishment of OTC to provide a permanent agency to administer GATT.

We appreciate the work you have already done in this area of liberal trade policies and urge you to continue your efforts.

Respectfully,

HARRIET S. FREDIN,
Mrs. C. M. Fredin

Second Vice President and International Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. IVES, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 3710. A bill to extend, until such time as compulsory military service under the laws of the United States is terminated, the provisions of title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to veterans who entered active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 3711. A bill for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (by request):

S. 3712. A bill to authorize appropriation for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which is sponsored by 12 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for the purpose of providing a program of unemployment compensation for veterans who entered the Armed Forces on or after February 1, 1955. This group of veterans, as Senators know, is popularly known as peacetime veterans.

Specifically, the bill extends the provisions of title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as compulsory military service under the laws of the United States is terminated. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is the committee with jurisdiction over this matter.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I held hearings on the subject of unemployment compensation for peacetime veterans during the last session of Congress, and the subcommittee has been considering the matter since the close of those hearings. At an executive session of the subcommittee held on Monday, April 21, the subject was discussed, and officials from the De-

partment of Labor presented statistical information on the cost of the program. The statistical information was not sufficiently up to date, however, and the subcommittee asked the Labor Department to submit more current information. The Department is developing this information now and will have it available for the subcommittee's next executive session, which is scheduled for Wednesday, April 30, at 3 p. m. At that meeting I believe the subcommittee will have all the relevant facts on this matter and will be in a position favorably to report to the full committee.

Mr. President, I point out that our bill provides unemployment compensation at the rate of \$26 a week, which is the rate now provided for Korean veterans under Public Law 550, 82d Congress. However, it may well be that this rate should now be increased for both Korean veterans and peacetime veterans in view of the fact that since the \$26 rate was established, the cost of living has increased considerably and the maximum compensation payable under State laws has also increased somewhat. In this connection, Senators will recall that the \$26 rate was originally determined by averaging out the rates of unemployment compensation payable under State laws.

I further point out that the unemployment compensation program provided by our bill departs from the pattern of the Korean veterans' program in two respects. First, unlike the Korean program, which provides compensation to an unemployed veteran who has served in the Armed Forces for 90 days or more, our bill requires that the veteran must have served for 2 years or more before he is entitled to unemployment compensation. Second, our bill provides that the duration of the compensation shall be for a period of 16 weeks, instead of 26 weeks as provided for Korean veterans. These revisions concern only peacetime veterans, of course, and in my judgment are necessary to maintain a reasonable distinction between wartime and peacetime service.

Finally, Mr. President, I again mention that 12 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are sponsoring this bill. The other members of the committee who are joining me in sponsoring the bill are Senator HILL, Senator MURRAY, Senator KENNEDY, Senator McNAMARA, Senator MORSE, Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator SMITH of New Jersey, Senator IVES, Senator PURTELL, Senator ALLOTT, and Senator COOPER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3710) to extend, until such time as compulsory military service under the laws of the United States is terminated, the provisions of title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to veterans who entered active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, introduced by Mr. THURMOND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RAMA ROAD IN NICARAGUA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize an additional appropriation of \$4 million to continue construction of the Rama Road, in Nicaragua. I have introduced the bill by request, pursuant to a letter from the Secretary of State, addressed to the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of State, which is explanatory of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3712) to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. CASE of South Dakota is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
April 3, 1958.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the appropriation of an additional \$4 million to continue construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua.

There are two principal reasons for the need for an additional authorization at this time. First, at the time the original estimate of the cost of completion was made in 1948, no detailed survey had been made and sufficient data was not at hand to make a complete detailed estimate with the result that the cost was underestimated. Second, there has been a substantial rise in construction costs between 1948 and 1957.

The United States by diplomatic note dated April 8, 1942, agreed, at its own expense, to (a) construct a highway between San Benito and Rama, and (b) survey and recommend a route from Rama to El Bluff. However, a subsequent agreement between the two parties has released the United States from its obligation concerning the Rama-El Bluff route. The present status of the Rama Road represents a partially fulfilled obligation of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua.

The Rama Road is designed to unite two sections of the country that have heretofore been completely separated except by air transport. This road runs from San Benito, which is located just north of the capital city, Managua, on the Inter-American Highway, across Nicaragua to Rama on the Escondido River. Traffic could then be moved by river to the Caribbean Sea. This area of Nicaragua has a promising agricultural future and is susceptible to rapid development as soon as adequate transportation is available.

Should the United States fail to abide by its commitment to Nicaragua, its reputation for integrity among the people of Latin America in general and of Central America in particular, would be seriously jeopardized. Sudden withdrawal of financial support for the Rama Road would above all cause deep disappointment in Nicaragua which would only serve to undermine the friendly, co-operative attitude of that country toward the United States.

Furthermore, and apart from the most important question of integrity and policy, there exists a very real financial consideration, namely, that to date \$11.5 million have

been appropriated for the construction of the Rama Road. Over two-thirds of the road has now been provided for and to abandon the project at this time would result in considerable reduction in the value of the road already built. When the part now under construction is completed the road will end in an unpopulated and undeveloped area so that full utilization of the eastern part of the road already built must wait until the road reaches Rama, the only center of population in the area.

I therefore recommend, Mr. Vice President, early introduction of this legislation.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

REGISTRATION, REPORTING, AND DISCLOSURE OF EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION BENEFIT PLANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2888) to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

USE OF TELEVISION IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 2119) to expedite the utilization of television facilities in our public schools and colleges and in adult training programs. The bill was introduced by me on May 17, and is now in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for hearings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be privileged to join as a cosponsor of the bill which was introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on April 24; namely, Senate bill 3686, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. The reason I ask unanimous consent to join as a sponsor does not affect my position that I would endeavor to override the Presidential veto on Senate bill 497. I give my reasons for feeling so strongly on the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, Senate bill 497, because that bill embodied, under the head "Flood Control," the following projects: MINNESOTA PROJECTS IN OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL (S. 497)

I. Navigation: (a) Modification of existing project at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis; (b) deepening of Minnesota River channel upstream from Mississippi, \$2,539,000.

II. Flood control: (a) Flood protection on Mississippi at Winona, \$1,620,000; (b) flood protection on Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, \$1,870,000; (c) flood protection on Root River at Rushford, Minn., \$796,000; (d) flood protection on Mississippi at St. Paul and South St. Paul—\$3,137,800, at St. Paul and \$2,567,700 at South St. Paul; Ruffy Brook and Lost River project in the Red River of the North Basin, \$632,000.

For years I had advocated enactment of these flood control measures. They became embodied in Senate bill 497. So we have suffered a setback in our efforts to have such projects developed. For that reason I wish to join as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3686. As I previously stated, I am prepared to vote to override the veto, if need be, in order to get these projects under way.

TECHNICAL CHANGES IN FEDERAL EXCISE-TAX LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] be added as additional cosponsors of the amendment, submitted by me, to the bill (H. R. 7125) to make technical changes in the Federal excise-tax laws, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POTTER IN THE LION'S DEN

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the course of the debate during the last 2 days, and the debate will continue today, the Senate has had before it many important problems concerning labor unions and the leaders of labor unions who have assumed positions of domination. The Senate has also had under consideration many important amendments to the proposed legislation in this field.

A very important article entitled "Potter in Lion's Den," written by Roscoe Drummond, was published last night in the Washington Evening Star, and also was published this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald. I commend a reading of the article to my colleagues, and to all others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as an indication of the extent to which some of the labor leaders go with reference to a distinguished Member of the United States Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UAW HEADS KEEP SENATOR AWAY FROM MEMBERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Politics in Michigan offers a revealing case study of what a progressive Republican Senator is up against in an election in which the union leaders are implacably fighting him.

The candidate is the incumbent Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, who himself used to polish gears at Pontiac and who has a voting record

which gives him a valid appeal to labor rank and file.

But the Michigan labor leaders, for reasons of their own, want no part of the liberal Republican war veteran. Their technique is to do everything in their power to make it impossible for him to put his case directly to the bulk of union membership.

The effect is to shield the union membership from an evenhanded presentation of the campaign issues and, with minute exceptions, to prevent labor rallies from hearing candidates whom the leaders want to see defeated.

Here is what has been happening in recent days:

Senator POTTER was served with a "not welcome" notice after he had agreed to address a meeting to which he had been invited by the board of directors of the Federal Credit Union of the Ford Rouge plant employees. It had been all arranged. The date had been set. POTTER had accepted. Then the Senator got a telephone call from Detroit advising him that some officials of the union were displeased with the invitation and explaining that it would take his hosts off the spot if he did not appear. The credit union is a part of local 600, the biggest United Automobile Workers local with some 65,000 members.

When it proved too embarrassing to erect a complete wall, without a single chink, between Senator POTTER and labor union membership, President Paul Silver of UAW Local 351 wrote a letter to the Senator openly questioning "the sincerity of your professed desire to meet shop workers face to face" but inviting him to speak at a meeting. POTTER accepted immediately. The chairman introduced him with a 25-minute tirade against the Republican Party. Following the speech and question-and-answer period August Schoole, president of the Michigan AFL-CIO council, put on an act mimicking the Senator's speaking mannerisms and sarcastically attacking his views.

The UAW headquarters in Detroit is constantly pointing to the fact that Senator POTTER refuses to appear on a UAW radio-TV program as evidence that the union is eager for him to speak to their members and that it is the Senator who refuses. Senator POTTER's view is that this is a fraud and a facade, that the UAW knows he will not appear on a radio-TV political program which he considers financed by a misuse of union dues and a violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

These events persuade Senator POTTER the UAW leaders want so badly to see him defeated that they are determined, so far as possible, to keep him from carrying his campaign directly to the UAW membership.

The puzzling question is: Why? Why should the union leadership be so intent upon shielding the union membership from hearing at their meetings both sides of the senatorial campaign, so that the members themselves could measure the merits of the candidates?

I can think of two reasons; perhaps there are others.

One is that UAW President Walter Reuther and his associates want to see Democratic Gov. Mennen Williams reelected for his sixth term by the largest possible majority to further his chances of getting the presidential nomination in 1960.

The other is that Senator POTTER has such a sound pro-labor record—on current anti-recession measures AFL-CIO officials in Washington scored him 75 to 85 percent on their side—that if he were allowed direct access to labor rank and file he might well win substantial labor support for himself and as a byproduct cut down Williams' vote for the governorship.

The massive opposition of union leadership to Senator POTTER may backfire as it did in favor of Senator Taft in Ohio in 1950. Obviously Senator POTTER is not going to lie down and roll over.

CONGRESS AND LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the Washington Star an article entitled "Congress and Labor Legislation—Union Funds in Campaigns Viewed as Keeping Majority From Acting." The article, which was written by David Lawrence, is a most illuminating one. Because it is so timely with reference to the matters the Senate now has under consideration, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND LABOR LEGISLATION—UNION FUNDS IN CAMPAIGNS VIEWED AS KEEPING MAJORITY FROM ACTING

(By David Lawrence)

The story of the year is being unfolded right now in Congress.

It's the story of how labor-union money—contributed heavily in recent political campaigns—keeps a majority of Members of Congress from enacting laws that would do away with the rackets whereby the dues of the workmen are stolen or misused.

It's the story also of how Congress, though knowing full well how boycotts of innocent parties are used to further the aims of labor unions, does nothing by way of legislation to correct the abuses.

It's the story of how goons and hired thugs intimidate American citizens who venture to assert their right to work and to cross picket lines.

Plenty of outcries are heard when civil rights are denied in other fields of constitutional law, but no such support is given the simple proposition that the American citizen must be free to join or not to join a union and, if he declines, that he must not for such reason alone be deprived of his job.

Today, in certain trades, a citizen cannot earn a livelihood unless he consents to become, against his will, a member of a labor union which can use his dues money to finance the election of candidates for public office with whose views the worker happens not to agree. Here is thought control and a denial of the basic principles embodied in the Constitution itself.

Today to cross a picket line in a big strike is to jeopardize one's life. Local police authorities are intimidated by the political power of labor unions and do not give adequate protection to the citizen. Companies that are not parties to a strike are sometimes boycotted if they buy materials or goods from a company that is having a labor dispute.

Financial irregularities have been disclosed in about five major unions. Many of the other big unions have not been investigated as yet. Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Democrat, has thrown the searchlight on the misuse of union funds. The newspapers have been printing articles about it for several months.

Now, however, the time has come for action. But it looks as if a majority in Congress is itself intimidated. Privately many Members say they would like to go ahead, but the Democratic Party—which is more beholden to the labor unions than are the Republicans—doesn't want to put the legislation through this year because it fears that individual Members might be hurt in the coming Congressional elections.

The plan all along has been to bury the legislation in committee in the Senate. There was to be no voting on broad aspects of the labor-union problem. But Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, Republican leader, took the bit in his teeth this

weekend and decided to try for rollcall votes which would make every Member answer to all the people and not just to the labor-union lobbies.

At first it was reported there wouldn't be a chance for action. Senator KNOWLAND, however, determined to attach his proposals to the pending legislation on labor-union welfare and pension funds. He knew that the Senate Committee on Labor wouldn't report out any broad legislation, so he decided to try to amend the bill on the floor of the Senate. The Democratic leadership had to submit the matter to a vote or be put in the position of sidetracking the legislation.

A change came as the Democratic leadership in the Senate decided to go ahead with the voting.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower was advised that he could not be indifferent to the opportunity opened up by Senator KNOWLAND's move. So Secretary of Labor Mitchell proposed some amendments that went beyond the welfare-and-pension provisions and sought corrective action on boycotts and picketing. He also sponsored a formula to insure secret elections of labor-union officers.

Though 3 days of debate were scheduled for the Senate, the result was foreclosed in advance. There were so many conflicting currents that whatever the Senate finally passed seemed already doomed to inaction in the House of Representatives. The Democratic leadership in the House is ready to block legislation the labor-union leaders oppose.

This labor-union dictatorship, using millions of dollars of workers' dues to exert political influence in staving off corrective legislation, still is on top. That's the story of the year—and, it might be added, the political scandal of the year.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Address delivered by him before B'nai Israel Congregation, Washington, D. C., April 25, 1958, commemorating 10th anniversary of independence of Israel.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address on feeder airlines, delivered by Senator BIBLE at the quarterly regional meeting of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, at Las Vegas, Nev., on April 11, 1958.

RETIREMENT OF MAX RABB

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Good Luck, Max Rabb," which appears this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald. The editorial pays a deserved tribute to the able and distinguished secretary of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, who is retiring from the governmental service to enter the private practice of law.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD LUCK, MAX RABB

Of all the members of the White House staff, Maxwell M. Rabb has been one of the most affable and most effective. As the first secretary of the Cabinet, Max Rabb has tried hard to transform that body from a pro forma and quasi-moribund institution into

a more meaningful forum for discussion of domestic policy. He has had a particular interest and concern in the problems of minority groups, and he has contributed notably to some of the good work of the Eisenhower administration in this field. A liberal Republican by disposition, he has been receptive to ideas, and he has helped to dispel the promises about the "palace guard" by humanizing the rather austere inner circle of the administration. Whether in his official duties or in gossiping at parties or in gazing at Gina Lollobrigida, Max Rabb has been a pleasant and energetic addition in Washington. As he leaves to take up private law practice in New York, his many friends will wish him and his attractive wife well.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in regard to the resignation of Hon. Max Rabb, assistant to the President. I must say that he will be missed by many friends in the Senate. He has made a distinguished record as assistant to the President, and I join with my Senate colleagues in wishing him continued success as he returns to the practice of the law.

ELIMINATION OF LOSS OF LIFE ON HIGHWAYS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few domestic problems are more important to the Nation than the ending of the carnage and loss of life on our streets and highways. It is becoming increasingly obvious that stricter and stronger regulation of drivers' licenses, with physical and mental tests for those who operate motor vehicles, is going to be imperative in the interest of humanity. Along this line, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a thoughtful and cogent letter which was written to the editor of the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., on December 5, 1957, by former Assistant Secretary of State William E. Healy, of Oregon. Mr. Healy formerly was in charge of motor-vehicle operation in our State.

I also ask unanimous consent that an informative editorial entitled "Cause and Effect," which was published in the Oregonian of that same date be printed in the RECORD. The editorial discusses not only the communication by former Assistant Secretary of State Healy, but also a speech on the same general subject, which was delivered by me in Portland, on December 2, to the Oregon Professional Safety Drivers' Advisory Council.

In addressing the council, I emphasized the fact that those who pilot airplanes in the clear, blue sky must undergo repeated tests of an intensive and detailed nature, but that far less diligence is exercised in deciding who shall pilot an automobile on crowded streets and roads.

The Oregon Professional Safety Drivers' Advisory Council is an organization of truck and bus operators whose sense of civic responsibility prompts them to try to do their part in improving driving standards and safety conditions in the operation of motor vehicles.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAUSE AND EFFECT

From the first page to the last, Monday morning's edition of the Oregonian was dotted with stories and photographs concerning Sunday's traffic mishaps. Rainy weather and heavy traffic at the end of the Thanksgiving holidays probably conspired to make driving conditions worse than normal. But such situations as that on Highway 99 south of Salem, where 44 cars were involved in smashups on 1 slippery section in a 2-hour period, would not occur if all the drivers were competent and careful.

The depressing record of personal injuries and property damage compiled in this State on a single day gives point to such proposals as that made in a letter on this page from William E. Healy, of Salem, and the plan suggested by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER in a talk Monday before the Oregon Professional Safety Drivers' Advisory Council.

The Senator's proposal is not new. It has been suggested many times by professionals in the motor-vehicle traffic control field; but the public has viewed the idea with disinterest. The plan contemplates the periodic reexamination of holders of motor-vehicle operator's licenses, to make certain they are physically and mentally qualified to pilot today's high-powered cars over today's high-speed, crowded highways.

Everyone gives lip service to suggestions of this sort, in principle. But anyone who tries to push such a plan out of the realm of theory into the field of practical application runs into all sorts of roadblocks.

In the first place, everyone who holds a driver's license—and that includes almost everybody—is determined to retain it at all costs. He is personally convinced that he is a good driver, and he is not ready to submit willingly to any new regulation which would allow some young whippersnapper of an examiner to decide, after a driving test, that he isn't.

Furthermore, the very large and important industries dependent on volume sales of automobiles, gasoline, oil, lubricants, accessories, and repairs view coldly any laws which might have the effect of cutting down the number of drivers and the miles traveled.

Much of this opposition is covert and passive. But it's there.

You can't get a license to fly an airplane in the comparatively empty sky without passing a most rigid examination and remaining qualified to meet the requirements for periodic renewals. But almost anyone, by passing a rudimentary test, can get a license to drive a car under conditions which statistics show are much more hazardous than those encountered in the sky. A good many Oregonians, middle-aged or older, never have taken a driver's test because these weren't required when they first received their licenses and operator's licenses, once issued, are subject to automatic renewal on payment of a fee.

Will Oregonians ever accept the personal hardships and sacrifices that some would have to endure for the welfare of the rest, by approving a stringent motor-vehicle operators' reexamination by law? Presently, it seems doubtful. But until the public will submit to more rigorous regulation of its driving habits, we will continue to see more of the sad headlines which speckled the Monday paper.

PROOF OF SKILL NEEDED

To the Editor:

A long step forward in the cause of safety on our streets and highways would be taken if State laws required a demonstration of ability and qualification on the part of those driving vehicles bigger or heavier than passenger cars.

Oregon law requires that the drivers of for-hire vehicles must obtain chauffeur licenses. To get this license it is necessary to answer a few additional questions in the written examination given all applicants for driver licenses. No additional physical or driving demonstration is required.

A chauffeur license, limited only to those who drive for a living, makes no reference to whether its owner drives a light panel or delivery truck, or whether his occupation is that of driving a truck and trailer having a gross weight of 76,000 pounds. As a matter of actual practice the driver of the panel or pickup many times does become the driver of the heavier equipment. Well-established commercial carriers do, of course, set up rigorous physical and mental requirements for their drivers. The Interstate Commerce Commission has strict rules governing the men who drive the vehicles in common carrier interstate movement.

But how about the nonregulated carrier? All he has to do is pass the very simple written examination for a chauffeur license. How about the private truckowner, or the passenger-car owner who leases a heavy truck? All he needs is the passenger-car driver license held by most of us.

As the holder of a valid Oregon driver license, I feel qualified to operate my four-door sedan. I know that I am not qualified to drive a 10-ton truck, and yet I can do it, legally, any time I wish. If I want to make a living driving that truck, all I have to do is answer a few simple questions, the answers to which are provided in the book given me by the State. If I do not want to drive for a living, I can rent the truck and drive it on my present passenger-car driver license.

State laws, like ICC regulations, should recognize the need of greater skill and training on the part of the operator of bigger and heavier vehicles, regardless of for what purpose they are used on our streets and highways.

WILLIAM E. HEALY.

SALEM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Holland	Neuberger
Barrett	Hruska	Payne
Beall	Ives	Proxmire
Carlson	Jackson	Schoepfel
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kefauver	Talmadge
Curtis	Knowland	Thurmond
Douglas	Kuchel	Thye
Ervin	Lausche	Wiley
Gore	Mansfield	Yarborough
Green	McClellan	
Hayden	Murray	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in the family.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZEL], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

POLAR LEGISLATION MAY BE KILLED BY BUREAUCRATIC THINKING IN EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Russia's recent charges regarding our strategic Air Force planes flying "in the direction of Russia" has forcibly called attention to the great importance of the Arctic region.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senate will be in order. Persons who do not have official business on the floor will please retire. Senators will cease audible conversation.

Mr. WILEY. This area is the shortest route between northern Europe and the United States. It is over this snow-covered territory that a Russia ICBM or jet bomber would most logically come in the event of a surprise attack. Similarly, this is the route our SAC planes would follow if and when it became necessary—as we hope it never will—to launch a counteroffensive.

I note with deep interest today's New York Times story that the United States and its allies may shortly propose, before the United Nations, international aerial inspection of an Arctic zone.

This might indeed break the ice for the open skies plan, long proposed by President Eisenhower.

SOVIET INTEREST IN ARCTIC

In making their own recent charges, the Russian leaders further tipped their hand as to their deep interest in the Arctic area. Recent reports show that Russia has long been conducting extensive studies in the Arctic. One recent newspaper account stated that Russia had most of the Arctic area mapped and

charted virtually down to the smallest crevasse.

Furthermore, during the current International Geophysical Year, Russia is availing herself of the opportunity to do the same thing with regard to Antarctica.

This repeated evidence of Russian interest in both polar regions serves to point out the lack of a coordinated program of study and research in the polar regions by the United States.

This is an age in which the world has shrunk, so that it takes only a few hours to fly around it, and every nation is in every other nation's back yard.

VITAL DEW LINE

Only recently, in cooperation with the Government of Canada, we have established the distant early warning radar network on Canada's northern frontier. This so-called DEW line is one of the main bulwarks of our defense system. This is our first real attempt to utilize the Arctic region. Russia, on the other hand, has without doubt long had a radar network on her Arctic borders and in all probability established missile launching sites throughout this area.

With regard to the south polar area, the United States fortunately has a long record of exploration and study in Antarctica. We have done more on this continent than any other nation, but still have only scratched the surface. Now Russia has moved into the area and has indicated that she is there to stay. We have welcomed the cooperation shown by Russian scientists in the IGY studies of Antarctica, but following this scientific project what will be our policy with regard to this area?

I am speaking now in relation to maintaining the national security of the United States. There is one law we cannot disregard, and that is the law of self-preservation. In this shrunken world we must keep up with the changing facts of life.

Permanent Russian occupation of Antarctica would mean that she has established herself in the backyard of the Western Hemisphere. Russian bases will be only minutes away from the homeland of our friends in South America. Strategically located submarine bases could conceivably control the shipping channels through the Straits of Magellan.

NEED TO ACT ON WILEY BILL

The Russian program with regard to both polar regions appears to be carefully planned and coordinated. They know what they want, and they are doing everything possible to get it. Can we afford to do less? We cannot afford to fall asleep, as we did before Pearl Harbor. That is one of the serious matters we must consider. We have been thinking in terms of recession and depression. We had better think in terms of our national safety, in this day of the H-bomb and the foreshortened earth.

As Senators know, I have a bill pending before the Education and Labor Committee calling for the creation of the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. This commission would serve as a coordinating agency for all United States

efforts in the polar regions. It would be responsible for planning and executing a long-range program of scientific study and research. It would help determine our legal rights and prerogatives with regard to territorial claims in Antarctica.

POLAR BILLS DEAD UNLESS ACTION IS TAKEN NOW

I regret to say, Mr. President, but I do say in all frankness, that Antarctic and Arctic legislation is, unfortunately on the basis of evidence now available, dead for this 85th Congress. We have closed our minds and our eyes to the significance of what it means to let the Kremlin take over ends of the earth. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has not scheduled hearings on my bill.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has indicated there is little chance of a hearing on a similar bill proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and referred to that committee.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House has held one day of hearings on a companion measure, sponsored by Representative CLARE ENGLE who is deeply interested in this subject. But the committee does not give indication that anything further is contemplated.

In part the reason for the lack of interest in the various committees is that the executive agencies most closely affected by this legislation have, for the most part, unfortunately, filed unfavorable reports on these bills. The reasons for this deplorable negative attitude by the executive agencies are known best in the bureaucratic minds of those key individuals who prefer the unsatisfactory status quo. There is no such thing as status quo any more. The world is on the move, and the Kremlin knows it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, time is running out. [Laughter.] We cannot remain in the position we were in prior to Pearl Harbor. That laughter reminds me—and it is good to be able to laugh—although my time may be running out, I do not want America's time to be running out.

The IGY will end in December. By not taking the proper action to determine our rights and prerogatives in Antarctica, we are leaving ourselves wide open for Russian territorial demands in this region. I hope that we will not be judged too harshly by future generations of Americans for our neglect in not asserting ourselves and allowing this unknown and undeveloped area to fall—by our default—into other hands. The our is late. It is not too late, but it is very late.

I send to the desk two items, the first is the New York Times story of today to which I have referred. The second is an editorial from the April 22d edition of the Milwaukee Journal having to do with the importance of Antarctica. I request

that they be printed with my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 25, 1958]
WEST TO ASK U. N. FOR AERIAL CHECK ON ZONE IN ARCTIC—UNITED STATES AND THREE ALLIES WILL SEEK SECURITY COUNCIL SESSION ON INSPECTION SETUP—CHALLENGE TO RUSSIANS—AIM IS TO GET SERIOUS TALKS ON SOVIET CHARGE OF PERIL IN FLIGHTS BY BOMBERS

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The United States and three of its allies are planning to ask for an early meeting of the United Nations Security Council to consider measures for aerial inspection of an Arctic zone.

For several days State Department officials have been working on a draft resolution. It is now believed to be nearing final form. Diplomatic sources said today that present plans called for putting the item on the Council agenda early next week.

The resolution's purpose would be to challenge the Soviet Union to return to the Security Council and seriously discuss measures to eliminate the dangers it has professed to find in flights of nuclear-armed United States bombers across the Arctic toward Soviet frontiers. Last week Moscow called them a threat to peace.

THREE NATIONS COOPERATE

The State Department has been working in close cooperation with Britain, France, and Canada on plans to get Council debate on measures against surprise attack.

Yesterday Secretary of State Dulles discussed the matter with Sir Harold Caccia, British Ambassador; Hervé Alphand, French Ambassador, and Norman Robertson, Canadian Ambassador. Sir Harold and Mr. Robertson were back at the Department today for talks with other high-ranking officials.

Diplomatic sources said tonight that it had not been decided which nation or nations would sponsor the resolution.

Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, charged at a Moscow news conference a week ago today that the United States was endangering the peace by sending bombers armed with thermonuclear bombs on flights across the Arctic toward the Soviet Union.

COUNCIL MEETING ASKED

The same day Arkady A. Sobolev, Soviet delegate to the United Nations, asked for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider the charge. He introduced a resolution under which the Council would have called on the United States to stop sending bombers toward other countries' frontiers.

The United States welcomed the Soviet move. The United States had been trying to get the Soviet Union to consider President Eisenhower's open-skies plan of aerial inspection ever since July 1955.

Last summer, the United States, Britain, France, and Canada proposed aerial inspection in a zone extending from the Arctic Circle to the North Pole, plus Alaska, the Aleutians, and the Kamchatka Peninsula. The Soviet Union rejected the plan.

Moreover, since last fall the Soviet Union has said it would boycott the Disarmament Commission and it recently rejected a Western plan to refer disarmament to the Security Council, which in turn would have referred it to a meeting of heads of government.

Therefore, the United States saw in the Soviet maneuver last week an opportunity to get the aerial inspection issue into United Nations, where the United States and its allies could bring up the question of inspection against surprise attack.

It is believed here that the Soviet Union quickly recognized that it had made a tactical error, for Mr. Sobolev withdrew the Soviet resolution when it became apparent it would not carry. However, the Soviet charges were not withdrawn, and the matter still remains on the agenda.

There is little expectation here that the Soviet Union will agree to discuss an Arctic zone of aerial inspection. But officials believe that no matter what reasons the Soviet Union puts forward against such an agreement, its motives and its good faith will be suspected.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 22, 1958]

LAST CONTINENT OF ADVENTURE

With the emergence of space travel and exploration from the realm of science fiction, it is well to remember that there is still a last continent of adventure left on earth. It is Antarctica, an area almost as large as Europe and the United States combined. Covered by inland ice that is sometimes 10,000 feet thick and with a mean annual temperature of -12.6°, Antarctica remains vastly unexplored and isolated from the rest of the earth.

Dr. Laurence M. Gould, president of Carleton College and chairman of the United States national committee's Antarctic study for the International Geophysical Year, points out in a recently published pamphlet that Antarctica is destined to play an increasingly important role in world affairs.

Dr. Gould foresees a day when trans-Antarctic flights from Australia to South America will be routine and will save many thousands of miles over present air travel patterns.

At present not more than two-tenths of 1 percent of Antarctica has been explored in detail geologically. There are vast deposits of coal and there is the possibility of rich mineral resources of commercial value.

Scientists are curious about Antarctica's role in the world picture of weather and climate. Little is known about the exchange of great air masses between the polar regions and the Tropics. That the vast Antarctic icecap has a profound effect on weather and climate has long been suspected.

Antarctica's weather role, Dr. Gould predicts, will prove so important that it will dramatize the urgency of maintaining Antarctic weather stations to provide a continuing flow of data for world weather maps.

"It has been wisely said," he writes, "that the major exports from Antarctica for a long time to come will be scientific data. It might also be said that some of these data may turn out in the long run to be of more value to mankind than all the mineral riches the continent may hold."

AMERICA'S CELEBRATION OF CHILD HEALTH DAY—THE IMPORTANCE OF SOUND MINDS AND SOUND BODIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, next Thursday, May 1, the Nation will observe Child Health Day.

This fine annual observance is based upon a proclamation of the President of the United States. Its origin dates back as far as 1928.

In these three decades tremendous advances have been made in the field of protecting the health of the Nation's greatest resource—our children.

I mention the observance today, because I am most interested in adequate advance preparations for it next week.

Health, of course, refers to more than the physical well-being of the youngsters. That is essential. But it in-

cludes, as well, the mental, emotional, the spiritual well-being of our children.

The youngsters who are, today, of sound mind and body will grow up to be adults with sound physical and mental being—healthy, wholesome, vigorous, clean.

THE HEALING ARTS, PLUS PARENTS AND TEACHERS

Toward this end we need the practitioners of all the healing arts; but we need, most of all, the fullest contributions of parent and teacher.

While the responsibility for each youngster begins in every individual home, it does not end there.

It is carried out in every classroom in the land; yes, in every church and Sunday school.

And we, of the Federal Government, have our responsibility, as well. This responsibility is demonstrated not only in the Children's Bureau and the United States Office of Education, but in the great research facilities in the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, where not only ills which afflict the bodies of youngsters are probed, but those which afflict their minds, as well.

SIX VARIED ASPECTS OF CHILD HEALTH

I send to the desk six items which illustrate what I have in mind. The first is a memorandum from the Children's Bureau describing the background of Child Health Day.

The second is an excerpt from the testimony of Dr. Robert Felix, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, as presented as an opening statement before the House Appropriations Subcommittee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on February 19 of this year.

ARTICLE IN LA CROSSE DIOCESAN PAPER ON ILL YOUNGSTERS

Third, as a follow-up on Dr. Felix' statement, I cite an article from the grassroots of America—from the capital of my own State. It is taken from the April 25, 1958, issue of the Register Times-Review, of La Crosse and describes testimony before the State legislative council's committee on mental health.

NEW CLINIC AT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL HERE

The fourth article turns to one phase of still another front—that of physical health. It describes the establishment last August of a new specialty clinic at Children's Hospital here, through a grant from the William Green Memorial Foundation. The purpose of this clinic is to study the affliction of cystic fibrosis—an ailment which has recently been brought vividly to the attention of the Congress by Representative COYA KNUTSON.

Finally, as an indication of the broad range of children's problems, I include two lists.

TWO LISTS OF VITAL GROUPS

One list consists of those national organizations which interest themselves in child welfare, as such.

The second list consists of those groups which are devoted to specialized health problems, affecting both adults and youngsters. They tend the needs of exceptional children.

Neither of these two lists is intended as complete. But they do give an indication of the diversity of interests of dedicated Americans throughout our land.

I ask unanimous consent that these six items be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a form of introduction to next Thursday's celebration.

May they and other groups—may all of us—make Child Health Day, 1958, an important milestone in youngsters' well-being.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, D. C.

CHILD HEALTH DAY—BACKGROUND
INFORMATION

Ever since 1928, the President of the United States each year has issued a proclamation setting May 1 as Child Health Day.

The proclamation is issued under authority of a joint Congressional resolution setting apart May 1 of each year as Child Health Day and inviting all agencies and organizations interested in child welfare to unite upon that day in the observance of such exercises as will awaken the people of the Nation to the fundamental necessity of a year-round program for the protection and development of the health of the Nation's children.

The impetus for Child Health Day grew out of the increasing awareness prior to and within the World War I period that children, the voteless ones, needed some special recognition of their needs.

Julia Lathrop, first chief of the Children's Bureau, in 1916 indirectly suggested the idea in a letter to the Secretary of Labor when she wrote, "May Day has a long and pleasant tradition among all English speaking children. It might well be chosen by their elders as a day which should be not only a festival but also year by year a celebration of some increase in the common store of practical wisdom with which the young life of the Nation is guarded by each community."

This concern with guarding the young life of the Nation was of remarkably recent origin when Miss Lathrop wrote her letter 36 years ago. The Children's Bureau itself was only 4 years old, and was just embarked on one of its first major campaigns: to cut down the number of deaths of mothers and their babies.

Few counties had a health department. The fight for better sanitation, for safer milk for babies, for adequate health supervision for children even before they started to school, all were current and in some cases controversial issues.

In April 1918, the Children's Bureau, with the approval of President Woodrow Wilson, proclaimed Children's Year to arouse the Nation to the importance of conserving childhood in times of national peril. The President allotted money from his war emergency fund for the campaign and said he hoped the goal of saving the lives of 100,000 infants and young people would be reached that year.

He hoped there would be developed "certain irreducible minimum standards for the health, education, and work of the American child."

Children's Year had several important focal points: (1) The prevention of the waste of child life; (2) the realization of an economic standard of life, permitting mothers to remain at home and care for their children; (3) the prevention of child labor by the substitution of school for work; (4) the provision of adequate, uncommercialized recreation; (5) the protection of special classes of children.

One of the chief activities of the year, conducted by the Children's Bureau with the Women's Committee of the Council of National Defense, was a weighing and measuring campaign. The Council set up a special child welfare department which organized 17,000 committees, representing the work of over 11 million women, in an effort to protect children from the effects of war.

Through the efforts of these women, over 6½ million well babies and children under school age were weighed and measured. Records of 100,000 of these children, who were given physical examinations by doctors, were subsequently used to set up, for the first time, some standards for height and weight in relation to age in growing children.

The second White House Conference, called in an effort to realize the hope of President Wilson that Children's Year would set child welfare standards, was held by the Children's Bureau in May 1919. The experts, from both here and abroad, who attended the conference held here and the regional conferences held over the country drafted minimum standards for public protection of the health of mothers and children, children entering employment and children in need of special care.

Among these were birth registration—then spotty over the country—with a requirement to report within 3 days of birth; children's hospitals, or beds in general hospitals for children; a sufficient number of children's health centers to give health instruction, under medical supervision, for all infants and children not under the care of private physicians and to give instruction in the care and feeding of children to mothers at least once a month throughout the first year.

Meanwhile, stimulated by the facts brought to light through Children's Bureau infant mortality studies, interest grew in Federal aid for maternity and infancy. Bills were introduced in two successive Congresses for this purpose, but failed of passage. In 1921, Senator Morris Sheppard and Representative H. M. Towner successfully sponsored a bill which the Congress passed, appropriating \$1,200,000 a year to help States build their health services for mothers and infants.

The Maternity and Infancy Act, commonly known as the Sheppard-Towner Act, in force from 1922 to 1929, was the forerunner of the more embracing title V of the Social Security Act, which was passed in 1935.

It was during the lifetime of the Sheppard-Towner Act that Mrs. Aida Acosta Breckinridge, associate director of the American Child Health Association, suggested to Herbert Hoover, president of the association and then Secretary of Commerce, that May Day be made an occasion for drawing public attention to the need to improve conditions surrounding child health.

Mr. Hoover suggested the idea to President Calvin Coolidge, who replied by saying, "I wish the organizations every success in an effort which will touch so sympathetic a chord in every American heart."

Under the aegis of the American Child Health Association, and with the help of many public and private agencies, May 1, 1924, was observed nationally as Child Health Day.

Three years later, the American Federation of Labor passed a resolution at its Los Angeles convention in October directing its executive council to have a resolution introduced in Congress setting aside May 1 each year as Child Health Day.

This project later was officially endorsed by the Conference of State and Provincial Health Authorities of North America, in November 1927.

Congressional action followed in the next year and on March 25, 1929, President Herbert Hoover issued the first Presidential proclamation under the joint resolution authorizing the Child Health Day observance.

His proclamation called for efforts to "bring about a nationwide understanding of the fundamental significance of healthy childhood and of the importance of the conservation of the health and physical vigor of our boys and girls throughout every day of the year."

During the early years of the national observance of May Day as Child Health Day, the emphasis on the celebration was on the physical aspects of health in children.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his first May Day proclamation in 1933, supported a slogan: "Mothers and babies first" as the Nation became increasingly conscious of the need to cut down on high maternal and infant mortality rates.

In 1935, the American Child Health Association was dissolved and the Children's Bureau was requested by the Conference of State and Provincial Health Authorities to sponsor Child Health Day activities.

Passage of the Social Security Act in 1935 gave the Children's Bureau its inspiration for the objective of the 1936 May Day observance. This objective was to review in each State and community the social-security program and other measures for child health and welfare, and to make plans for their further development.

In 1938, a part of the theme was planning how the child-health work of our public and private agencies can be extended and made more effective.

The fourth White House conference on children and youth was called by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1940 to consider children in a democracy as its theme.

During the decade from 1940 to 1950, most of the May Day observances were centered around very specific objectives. In 1942, for instance, Child Health Day initiated a campaign for immunization against diphtheria and smallpox. The following year the health of teenage boys and girls holding war jobs was the May Day theme.

In other years, birth registration, community planning, prevention of accidents in the home, medical and dental examinations for children entering school for the first time were emphasized.

Throughout these decades of the century, one by one, new medical and scientific discoveries gave assurance that means were at hand or were on the way for protecting children from many of the physical ills which had been of such prime concern earlier.

When the 1950 White House conference on children and youth was held, its emphasis was not so much on physical health as on healthy personality for children.

In preparation for this conference, a fact-finding committee drew on the knowledge of experts throughout the country—psychologists, psychiatrists, pediatricians, anthropologists, sociologists, physiologists, geneticists—to pull together what is known about the development of personality in children.

The committee's report since has been popularized and issued by the Children's Bureau as *A Healthy Personality for Your Child*, a publication for parents.

It is around the theme of putting to good use what we know about the way human beings acquire the personal qualities essential to individual happiness and responsible citizenship, the healthy personality, that the Children's Bureau invites the Nation to plan the observance of May Day.

MENTAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN
(Statement by Dr. Robert Felix)

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

The Institute has been conducting a broad range of normal child development studies, including the effects of social environment on learning, the effects of family and community influences on general development, comparative studies of babies in normal

homes and in institutions, the relationship of mother's personality to the personality and development of children, and the effects of individualized attention on responsiveness in infants.

Institute investigators have devised a means of objectively measuring attitudes of parents toward children and child rearing. This test, known as the parental attitude research instrument, is being used in our laboratories and in laboratories throughout the country to study the relationships of such attitudes to parent-child relations and to child development. It has already shown some interesting correlations between parental attitudes and emotional and social adjustment of children, including children's activities and intelligence scores and may play a role in the complicated problem of predicting personality development.

DELINQUENCY AND EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS

Support of research on juvenile delinquency continues to be an important Institute concern. Twenty research projects totaling \$600,403 have received support to date in fiscal year 1958. A clinic in Boston, assisted by a mental health grant, is making an intensive diagnostic study of hyperaggressive, uncontrollable boys and their families. Other centers, with the aid of grants, are attempting to develop improved techniques for diagnosis and treatment. One center is studying a group of 50 delinquents who had come before the juvenile court during 1957, and another is concentrating on the effects of the family and social situation.

During the past year, the Institute opened its new Children's Treatment Center and transferred to it the group of emotionally disturbed boys who had been under study at the Clinical Center. The new treatment center is a cottage-type residential facility where the children, who have now recovered to the point where they can attend school and lead a more normal life, are being studied in terms of the therapeutic milieu. In the meantime, new groups of children with other types of severe emotional disturbances are being studied in the Child Research Branch's Clinical Center ward facilities.

Institute researchers working with hyperaggressive children find that these children (1) display a unique kind of pathology that combines aspects of childhood neuroses and psychoses; (2) show intense anxiety about the possibility of being dependent; and (3) have severe problems in developing a sense of their role in society. Progress is being made in analysis of learning disturbances in these children, and in developing and improving therapeutic techniques.

MENTAL HEALTH IN THE SCHOOL SETTING

Because of the school's crucial role in building the foundation for individual mental health, the Institute has increased its efforts in this direction and is now supporting a large amount of research on school mental health. Recently a major study was initiated in which a teacher-training institution will investigate the psychological aspects of the events and processes that take place in the classroom, the school, and the community to determine their effects on the children's mental health and on the educational efforts of the school.

The Institute is developing plans, in its training program, to encourage the addition of more functional knowledge about the behavioral sciences in the preparation of teachers to help them deal with emotional problems encountered in a classroom setting. An Institute psychiatrist is devoting full time to consultation with schools, assisting them in applying knowledge currently available. Working in cooperation with the State board of health and department of education, the Institute has helped one State set up a case-finding program, to demonstrate ways and means by which communities can detect

and manage minor mental health problems in schoolchildren.

Investigators at the Institute's Mental Health Study Center, conducting a follow-up study, have found that reading disability is related not only to the child's intellectual development, but even more so to his emotional difficulties, and that these difficulties usually presage a high dropout rate from school. The goal of this and other similar studies is to learn how the schools can best minimize the effects of emotional problems already present and prevent the development of others.

MENTAL RETARDATION

To date, during fiscal year 1958, the National Institute of Mental Health has supported a total of 19 research grants directly in the field of mental retardation for a total of \$493,536. These investigations range from studies of amino acid metabolism and phenylketonuria and the role of heredity, to studies of diagnostic and learning problems in retardation.

A number of basic research investigations in the Institute's laboratories are concentrated on the biochemical and neurophysiological aspects of retardation. In addition, NIMH scientists are cooperating with research workers from other Institutes, including the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

Institute funds are being used to train professional personnel needed to do research on retardation and to work with the retarded. Consultation and assistance are being provided to States and local communities in the establishment and development of programs for the mentally retarded, and a portion of Federal grants-in-aid funds is being allocated by the States for special projects on mental retardation.

[From the Register Times-Review of April 25, 1958]

CENTER IS NEEDED FOR EMOTIONALLY SICK CHILDREN

MADISON.—Wisconsin needs a State-operated residential treatment center for emotionally disturbed children, a welfare leader told the Legislative Council's Committee on Mental Health April 8.

Msgr. Norbert Dall, Diocesan Catholic Welfare Bureau director, appeared before the committee on behalf of the La Crosse Diocese and of local community councils serving the 19-county area.

The committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Kirby Hendee, of Milwaukee, was conducting a public hearing on the care and treatment of emotionally disturbed children.

STUDYING PROBLEMS

Senator Hendee's committee is making a study of the various aspects of the problems of mental health and programs for children and youth, and of the role which a child center should play in future plans for child care.

Monsignor Dall also made a plea for tax support of psychological and psychiatric services to the public and private welfare agencies of the State. He suggested outpatient facilities, guidance clinics, and traveling psychologists and psychiatrists.

LOCAL AGENCIES

He explained that most case work of the welfare agencies takes place in local communities through district offices of the State welfare department, county welfare departments, and courts. As a result, most services should be concentrated in local agencies. Local agencies could be much more helpful to persons in need if State-encouraged clinical services were made available to them, he said.

In his plea for a treatment center, he explained that a small number of children

need special care available only in such an institution staffed by qualified psychiatrists and other specialists. The cost of building and operating such an institution, he said, is beyond the resources of any voluntary or private agency.

Courts and welfare agencies can help some children through security programs and energetic management, Monsignor Dall said. But there is a need for a special center for children whose delinquency patterns are more psychopathic in nature and need psychiatric treatment, and for children who show signs of mental illness.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 14, 1957]

SPECIALTY CLINIC ESTABLISHED HERE FOR CHILD VICTIMS OF CYSTIC FIBROSIS (By Nate Hasetline)

Establishment of a specialty clinic at Children's Hospital for victims of the little-known but deadly childhood affliction, cystic fibrosis, was announced yesterday.

The clinic, believed to be the first endowed one of its kind in the Nation, got its start with a \$25,000 grant from the William Green Memorial Fund. Its proponents hope labor organizations will provide further financing to perpetuate the name of the late president of the American Federation of Labor.

The clinic provides diagnosis and treatment of victims of the hereditary ailment, often confused with a variety of less serious ills, and carry out research.

Cystic fibrosis, estimated to occur in about 1 of every 600 live births, has also been called mucoviscidosis, fibrocystic disease of the pancreas, pancreatic fibrosis, and most graphically, the disease of the salty tears.

SWEAT TESTS USED

Before 1951, the condition was generally diagnosed from histories of its victims' complaints, following a confusion of episodes of diarrheas, other gastrointestinal ills, celiac disease (inability to digest fats), asthma and repeated bouts of bronchial pneumonia. Then doctors found it readily diagnosable in excess salt content of tears, and more particularly perspiration.

Though it became known as the disease of salty tears, the doctors found that sweat tests were more reliable, and practical. In the now conventional test the patient is encased in a transparent plastic bag, from the neck down, and induced to perspire. Salt content of the victim's sweat is 3 to 5 times that of the unaffected.

The William Green Children's Clinic, as now named, was organized after joint requests by the hospital's physicians and members of the Washington chapter of the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation. The latter is a band of about 40 determined parents of still-living or dead child victims of the disease. The chapter was formed about 2 years ago.

ANTIBIOTICS USED

Dr. Robert Parrott, Children's Hospital physician-in-chief, said that known or suspect cases of cystic fibrosis will be referred to the clinic for definitive diagnosis. Those who fail the sweat test, he said, will be offered multidisciplinary care with their own doctor a key part of the clinic team.

At present, little but supportive treatment and antibiotic protections can be offered fibrosis patients. Daily or other periodic dosings of antibiotics, such as penicillin, help prevent common childhood infections, since even a normally slight cold can prove fatal to these children.

Dr. Parrott said that a chief infection offender in fibrosis victims are the staphylococci, or pus-forming germs, which attack their disease-impaired lungs. For this reason, he said, clinic research will be oriented to microbiological studies of this aspect of the disease.

The clinic's official start, after long and hopeful planning, took place yesterday when James E. Weber, of 4701 Chevy Chase Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md., presented the \$25,000 check from the William Green Memorial Fund to Dr. Parrott. Weber, who lost a daughter to cystic fibrosis, is president of the local chapter.

LIST OF NATIONAL GROUPS INTERESTED IN CHILD HEALTH

American Academy of Pediatrics, 1801 Hinman Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
 American Legion, National Child Welfare Division, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
 American Parents Committee, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East 69th Street, Chicago, Ill.
 Child Study Association of America, Inc., 132 East 74th Street, New York, N. Y.
 Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 345 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.
 Council of National Organizations for Children and Youth, care of National Social Welfare Assembly, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.
 National Association of Training Schools and Juvenile Agencies, 401 State Office Building No. 1, Sacramento, Calif.
 National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, Welfare section, 122 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
 National Council of State Committees for Children and Youth, University of California at Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard, Los Angeles, Calif.
 National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 226 W. 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
 National Jewish Welfare Board, 145 East 32d Street, New York, N. Y.
 The Salvation Army, Women's and Children's Services, 120-130 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.
 Society for Research in Child Development, 1341 Euclid Avenue, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.

ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HELP EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, 1537 35th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 American Annals of the Deaf, Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C.
 American Association for Gifted Children, Inc., 15 Gramercy Park, New York, N. Y.
 American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 American Association on Mental Deficiency, Post Office Box 96, Willimantic, Conn.
 American Foundation for the Blind, 15 West 16th Street, New York, N. Y.
 American Hearing Society, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 American Heart Association, 44 East 23d Street, New York, N. Y.
 American Occupational Therapy Association, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
 American Physical Therapy Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 American Psychological Association, 1333 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 American Speech and Hearing Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
 Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Girl Scouts of the United States of America, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
 International Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 League for Emotionally Disturbed Children, 10 West 65th Street, New York, N. Y.

Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

National Association for Gifted Children, 409 Clinton Springs Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

National Association for Mental Health, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N. Y.

National Association for Retarded Children, Inc., 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.

National Epilepsy League, room 1916, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

National Health Council, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

National Probation and Parole Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

National Recreational Association, 8 West Eighth Street, New York, N. Y.

National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc., 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week the Senate adopted a resolution in commemoration of Israel's 10th anniversary. I was away from the Senate on official business that day, but at this time I commend the resolution. I also wish to add my name to the list of Americans who look with pride and warm friendship on the independent State of Israel.

As the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] so ably pointed out on Wednesday, Israel has been "worth more than her weight in gold in terms of reliability, and of value to the interests of free nations in a strife-torn area of the world."

As the Senator from New York also mentioned, everything which was said by those of us who pleaded for aid to Israel in the Mutual Security program in 1951, 1952, and 1953 has come true.

Ten years ago the independent State of Israel was born. Shortly after Prime Minister Ben-Gurion proclaimed Israel's independence, the armies of five Arab States invaded Israel.

At that time the State had 650,000 Jewish inhabitants, while the invading countries had a combined population of more than 30 million. The Arab armies were defeated and expelled, the area of Israel was increased, and the new Jerusalem again became the capital of Israel as in the days of King David.

But one of Israel's most distinctive features, brought out by Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, is that during the past decade—during Israel's first 10 years—it has trebled its population. At the end of 1957, Israel had a population of 1,976,471.

If I am not mistaken, the United States did not treble its own population until 35 years had passed since its war of independence. About a million immigrants from 97 different countries came to Israel during its first decade.

I am happy and honored to join in congratulating Israel on this 10th anniversary, and I join in hopes and prayers

that she will remain a bulwark against all forms of aggression and tyranny for many more years to come.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, upon behalf of the people of my State, I join with my colleagues in extending congratulations and good wishes to the people and to the Government of Israel at this time of the celebration of the 10th anniversary of their independence.

In a single decade Israel has become a nation and the home of 2 million people. They are a free and independent people who have come from many countries in the world and who have held their purpose and faith through every difficulty. Through their industry, Israel has become a force in the economy of the Middle East, and, with larger meaning, Israel stands today as a sovereign nation of true freedom and democracy in that region and in the world.

I know of the warm feeling the Jewish people of Kentucky and of the Nation hold for Israel. It is shared by their fellow countrymen all over our Nation. We are proud that an ancient faith has been realized. We hope for Israel and its people the attainment of the true peace they seek.

INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the 2 months from the middle of February to the middle of April are normally months of expanding employment and diminishing unemployment. This is, of course, due to the coming of spring and of warmer weather, which encourages the building of houses, and other building construction and which increases the opportunity for outdoor work. It is lamentable that this year such an expansion has not occurred.

As we all know, there are two sets of figures on unemployment. One is a monthly figure based upon a sampling of some 35,000 families by the Bureau of the Census. It showed an estimated total of 5,200,000 unemployed at the middle of March.

The other is a weekly figure on the insured unemployed, the information for which is collected by the Department of Labor.

It is interesting to note that the figure for the insured unemployed was 3,338,000 on February 15, and 3,493,000 on March 15. Yesterday I learned that the total for the week ending April 12 was 3,594,000. I give these figures to the nearest thousand. In other words, there has been an increase of 257,000 in the number of insured unemployed from the middle of February to March 12. This figure includes not only the 3,433,000 insured unemployed under State and the Federal employee systems but also the 150,000 unemployed railway workers and the 80,300 insured veterans.

Normally in months past, the insured unemployed have formed about 63 percent of the total unemployed, as shown by the Bureau of the Census. The insured unemployed do not include those who are unemployed but have not yet made their application for benefits or who are not receiving benefits. They do

not include those who have exhausted their claims for benefits—and the Secretary of Labor estimates that 500,000 persons have exhausted their claims for benefits—and, of course, the figures for the insured unemployed do not include the so-called uncovered occupations.

If this ratio of 63 percent were to be applied, it would indicate that the probable full-time unemployment for the month of April was 5,700,000. I do not say that is the correct figure, because the factor of 63 percent does not apply precisely to the middle of March. But I believe it can be said very definitely that there has been no pickup in March and there has been no pickup thus far in April, despite the fact that normally a pickup of several hundred thousand in employment would be expected, with a corresponding decrease in unemployment.

We may find there has been a very appreciable increase in unemployment, and the statistics for the insured unemployed seem so to indicate.

We should also remember that in a little more than 6 weeks the high schools and colleges will be graduating large numbers of students, a large proportion of whom will go into the labor market, to seek jobs; and thus the labor force will be increased by probably not far from 2 million persons.

In view of these demonstrable facts, I cannot understand the position the White House has taken; namely, that conditions are improving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a good point at which to stop—when I say that I cannot understand the attitude of the White House that conditions are improving. All the evidence is to the contrary.

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received today from the President of the United States dealing with rivers and harbors projects.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 25, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: In my message of April 15 to the Senate concerning S. 497, I pointed out that there were included many water resource development projects that were in the public interest. I believe these should be promptly enacted into law.

There is enclosed a list, designated attachment A, of those projects and provisions which were included in S. 497 as passed by the Congress, the authorization and enactment of which I recommend at an early date. I am also enclosing another list, designated attachment B, of projects and provisions which I also recommend when modified as indicated.

I would like to reiterate what I said in my message of April 15 about the proposals for protection from hurricane flooding in tidal

waters. These are useful and necessary projects, but further thought must be given to the degree of local participation in the cost of such work. The Secretary of the Army is now preparing suggestions as to appropriate division of responsibility for this program. I shall submit my recommendations for legislation on this score to the Congress in the near future.

Legislation consistent with the foregoing will be approved.

I am sending a similar letter to JOE MARTIN.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ATTACHMENT A

ACCEPTABLE PROVISIONS AND PROJECTS

Section 101: Navigation and beach-erosion projects.

NAVIGATION

Salem Harbor, Mass.
Boston Harbor, Mass.
East Boat Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Mass.
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.
New York Harbor, N. Y.
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.
Herring Creek, Md.
Betterton Harbor, Md.
Delaware River anchorages.
Morehead City Harbor, N. C.
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.
Port Everglades Harbor, Fla.
Escambia River, Fla.
Gulfport Harbor, Miss.
Barataria Bay, La.
Chesapeake River and Bogue Falia, La.
Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.
Galveston Harbor and Houston Ship Channel, Tex.
Matagorda Ship Channel, Port Lavaca, Tex.
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.
Freeport Harbor, Tex.
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (damages).
Mississippi River at Alton, Ill. (commercial harbor).
Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, Beaver Slough.
Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa (damages).
Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam No. 26.
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.
Minnesota River, Minn.
Vermilion Harbor, Ohio.
Ohio River at Gallipolis, Ohio.
Licking River, Ky.
Saxon Harbor, Wis.
Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.
St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.
Old Channel of Rouge River, Mich.
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.
Toledo Harbor, Ohio.
Santa Cruz Harbor, Calif.
Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.
Siuslaw River, Oreg.
Port Townsend Harbor, Wash.
Bellingham Harbor, Wash.
Douglas and Juneau Harbors, Alaska.
Dillingham Harbor, Alaska.
Naknek River, Alaska.
Cook Inlet Navigation Improvements, Alaska
San Juan Harbor, P. R.

BEACH EROSION

Connecticut, area 9.
Connecticut shoreline, areas 8 and 11,
Saugatuck River to Byram River.
Fire Island Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.
Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, N. J.
Kitts Hummock to Fenwick Island, Del.
Palm Beach County, Fla.
Berrien County, Mich.
Manitowoc County, Wis.
Fair Haven Beach State Park, N. Y.

Hamlin Beach State Park, N. Y.
Humbolt Bay, Calif.
Santa Cruz County, Calif.
San Diego County, Calif.

Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Bay, Hawaii.

Section 102.
Section 103.
Section 105.
Section 106.
Section 107.
Section 108.
Section 109.
Section 110.
Section 111.
Section 112.
Section 113.
Section 201.
Section 202.

Section 203: Flood control and multiple-purpose projects;

Connecticut River Basin: Littleville Reservoir, Mass.; Mad River Reservoir, Conn.

Housatonic River Basin: Dam on Hall Meadow Brook, Conn.; Dam on East Branch of Naugatuck River, Conn.

Susquehanna River Basin: North Branch,

Susquehanna River, N. Y. and Pa.

Panango and Cucklers Creek, N. C.

Mobile River Basin: Alabama River at Montgomery, Ala.

Lower Mississippi River: Wolf River, Tenn.; Bayou Chevreuil, La.

Arkansas River Basin: Trinidad Dam (Purgatoire River), Colo.

Upper Mississippi River Basin: Rock and Green Rivers, Ill.; Eau Galle River at Spring Valley, Wis.; Mississippi River at Winona, Minn.; Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn.; Root River at Rushford, Minn.

Great Lakes Basin: Bad River at Mellen and Odanah, Wis.; Kalamazoo River at Kalamazoo, Mich.; Grand River, Mich.; Saginaw River, Mich.; Oswego River at Auburn, N. Y.

Missouri River Basin: Sun River at Great Falls, Mont.; Cannonball River at Mott, N. Dak.; Floyd River, Iowa; Black Vermilion River at Frankfort, Kans.; Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebr.; Salt Creek and tributaries, Nebr.; Shell Creek, Nebr.

Red River of the North Basin: Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minn.

Ohio River Basin: Upper Wabash River and tributaries, Ind.; Brush Creek at Princeton, W. Va.; Meadow River at East Rainelle, W. Va.; Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River at Jamestown, N. Y.; West Branch of the Mahoning River, Ohio; Chartiers Creek, Washington, Pa.; Sandy Lick Creek at Brookville, Pa.; Monroe Reservoir, Ind.

Sacramento River Basin; Chico Landing to Red Bluff, Calif.

Eel River Basin: Sandy Prairie Region, Calif.

Weber River Basin: Weber River and tributaries, Utah.

San Dieguito River Basin.

Columbia River Basin: Bruces Eddy Dam, Idaho.

Sammanish River Basin: Sammanish River, Wash.

Territory of Alaska: Chena River at Fairbanks, Alaska; Cook Inlet, Alaska (Taleetna).

BASIN AUTHORIZATIONS

Connecticut River Basin.
Savannah River Basin.
Central and southern Florida.
Lower Mississippi River Basin: Old and Atchafalaya Rivers (navigation lock); St. Francis River Basin.

Upper Mississippi River Basin.
Missouri River Basin.

Sacramento River Basin.

San Joaquin River Basin.

Kaweah and Tule River Basins.

Los Angeles River Basin.

Santa Ana River Basin.

Columbia River Basin.

Section 204.
Section 206.
Section 207.
Section 208.
Section 209.
Section 210.

ATTACHMENT B

ACCEPTABLE PROJECTS UNDER CONDITIONS
STATED

If authorized in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers:

1. Millwood Reservoir and alternate reservoirs, Arkansas and Oklahoma.

2. Hendry County, Fla.

3. Saline River, Ill.

4. Tombigbee River, Miss. and Ala.

5. Carlsbad, N. Mex.

6. Socorro, N. Mex.

If authorized in accordance with recommendations of the Secretary of the Army:

1. Des Moines River, Iowa.

2. La Quinta Channel, Tex.

If authorized in accordance with House-passed version of S. 497:

1. Mississippi River at Alton, Ill. (small-boat harbors).

2. Irondequoit Bay, N. Y.

3. Port Washington, Wisc.

If authorized as recommended by the administration:

1. Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, Ark. and La.

2. White River backwater, Ark.

3. Kaskaskia River, Ill.

4. Markham Ferry Modification, exclusive of amendments to Section 3 of 1954 act.

5. White River Basin, exclusive of additional project authorization.

If authorized to provide a limit of 50 percent Federal participation:

1. Section 104: Water hyacinth program.

If authorized without the flood control features that are not economically justified:

1. Mohawk River, N. Y.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the New York Times of April 24 appear three headlines on the economy worthy of special note. One reads, "Food Costs Lift Price Index to Another Record Level." Another reads, "Climb Is Resumed in Jobless Claims." And the third reads, "Eisenhower Calls Recession Minor; Appeals for Calm."

These headlines speak for themselves. Here we are in the midst of the longest and most severe recession in 25 years with prices mounting to new alltime highs and the roles of the jobless still increasing, and the President of the United States tells us that this is nothing more than a minor emergency.

I wonder how minor this recession is to the more than 5 million jobless throughout our country. And I wonder how minor this recession is to millions of businessmen who see their sales and profits falling off. And I wonder how minor this recession is in the eyes of the world which sees United States production having declined by more than 10 percent in the past year while the Soviet Union's production has increased 11 percent.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article on rising unemployment be inserted at this point in the RECORD along with the latest consumer price index showing the rise of 0.7 points in March, which is as large as any rise in any month in the past 2-year period of steadily rising prices.

There being no objection, the article and price index were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLIMB IS RESUMED IN JOBLESS CLAIMS—RECORD IS SET IN MICHIGAN—NEW APPLICATIONS DROP IN SOME SECTIONS

(By Stanley Levey)

After a brief period of uneasy stability, claims for unemployment-insurance benefits rose significantly last week in many parts of the country.

The only promising indication came from a decline in new applications for jobless payments in some industrial areas. But this trend was often counterbalanced by an increase in the number of unemployed who had exhausted their eligibility for benefits.

These were the important developments: Insurance claims in hard-hit Michigan went up nearly 20,000 to the State's highest total on record. In Detroit alone 11,879 more persons were added to the rolls, raising the city figures to 209,949.

In New York State the number of insured jobless rose 8,000 to 463,000. The total was 99 percent above the level a year ago and was the highest for any April since 1946. The record for the State is 589,500, reached in June 1949.

AUTO INDUSTRY CUTBACKS

The Michigan-Detroit story was told in terms of heavy cutbacks in the automotive industry. Car manufacturers, operating on reduced production schedules, continued the policy of shutting down various plants a week at a time. The objective is to gear production closely to sales, which have not been good, and to hold down dealer inventories, now close to 850,000 cars.

But the situation was also complicated by layoffs in steel plants, automotive suppliers, and mining operations in the upper peninsula. Following are some figures:

Total claims in the State last week were 362,228, up nearly 6 percent from the adjusted figure of 342,265 for the previous week. The latest total was 237 percent greater than a year ago. The previous high was set 2 weeks ago when claims numbered 351,024. Before that the record was 333,400, set in July 1938.

And prospects appeared dim for any substantial reduction in unemployment for the present. New claims—an index carefully watched by economists—increased in the State to 48,631. The week before they had been 37,047. In Detroit initial applications were up to 29,762 from 21,224.

In New York, Isador Lubin, State industrial commissioner, blamed 1-week layoffs in the automobile, automotive supply, and electrical machinery industries for the rise in insurance claims. Buffalo was hardest hit by the automobile cutbacks but also suffered layoffs in other durable goods industries.

244,600 CLAIMS IN CITY

In this city claims totaled 244,600. This was the highest figure since the recession began, but it was far short of the high reached in June 1949 when the claims figure was 391,700.

New claims here dropped but this improvement was offset in the rest of the State where new applications raised the overall total to 63,017.

From January 1 through last week 36,876 persons in the State had exhausted their eligibility. They are thus not included in the overall total. In that same period the State paid out \$162 million in benefits, compared with \$90 million for the first 3½ months of 1957.

Commissioner Lubin also released data showing that total nonfarm employment in March increased by 17,000 over February. This brought the figure to 5,987,000. It was the lowest seasonal rise in recent years,

except for the recessions of 1949 and 1954, Mr. Lubin said.

Unemployment continued its slow rise in both Chicago and Illinois. There appeared to be some surface trends toward stability but this indication was discounted in advance by announced layoffs in tractor and farm machinery plants that will come later this month. They will be reflected in later reports.

INSURED JOBLESS UP

In Chicago the number of persons receiving jobless benefits was working back up toward the February high of 116,192. For the week ended April 12 it was 114,545. For the State as a whole insured unemployment was up by 877 for the week to 196,066.

But initial claims in both city and State were down. The conclusion appeared to be that fewer persons were laid off, but, at the same time, fewer persons returned to work.

Industrial Pennsylvania continued to show an increase in jobless-insurance claims. The latest figure is 347,396, up 4.7 percent from the previous week and 98.8 percent from the same week in 1957. Insured unemployment climbed again in Philadelphia.

Massachusetts was one of the few industrial States to show a drop in insurance applications. Last week's total was 125,646, compared with 127,056 a week earlier. But Boston claims rose from 14,726 to 15,194. New claims were down in the State and city. It was the first time this year for Boston and the second in a row for the State.

In Los Angeles there was a slight downturn in new claims last week. But continuing claims were up 1.4 percent to 140,293. The construction industry, helped by better weather, recalled some workers, as did employers in the electrical machinery and instrument fields.

For California as a whole, continuing claims remained almost unchanged. Last week they were 318,563. The week before they had been 318,831. The situation was similar in San Francisco, where last week's total was 51,231, compared with 51,554 the week previous. But initial claims in the metropolitan area were off 16.3 percent.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, BUREAU OF LABOR
STATISTICS

UNITED STATES

[New York Times April 24, 1958]

	Index for March 1958	Percentage change from—		Point change from February 1958
		February 1958	March 1957	
All items.....	123.3	+0.7	+3.7	+0.08
Food.....	120.8	+1.8	+6.7	+2.1
Housing ¹	127.5	+2	+2.1	+2
Apparel.....	106.8			
Transportation.....	138.7	+1	+2.7	+2
Medical care.....	142.3	+3	+4.3	+4
Personal care.....	128.3	+2	+4.4	+3
Reading, recreation.....	117.0	+3	+5.9	+4
Other goods, services.....	127.2	+2	+2.4	+2

NEW YORK CITY

All items.....	121.2	+0.7	+4.5	+0.9
Food.....	122.0	+2.4	+8.6	+2.9
Housing ¹	124.0	-2	+2.4	-3
Apparel.....	106.8	+1	+6	+1
Transportation.....	138.8	-1	+7	-2
Medical care.....	130.1	+1	+1.5	+1
Personal care.....	121.3	+3	+5.6	+4
Reading, recreation.....	118.5	-9	+8.5	-1.1
Other goods, services.....	126.5	+2	+1.3	+3

¹ Estimates for rent, home purchases, and other home-owner costs are reflected in monthly tables.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of April 24 there appears a very interesting article by Carroll Kilpatrick entitled "Averting

Slumps" which tells of the views on the recession held by the noted economist Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard.

It is the opinion of Professor Slichter that tight-money policies should have been relaxed much sooner than they were but, because of the preoccupation with inflation credit, was not eased until the recession was already well underway. Professor Slichter also feels that the proper time to have cut taxes was early this year when such a move may well have checked the recession at its most rapid downward stage.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**AVERTING SLUMPS—IMPROVED INSIGHTS
NEEDED, SLICHTER SAYS**
(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Since shortly after the end of World War II, when the economy successfully made the difficult transition from war to peace, many economists have been saying that Government can prevent serious depressions in this country.

That view was basic to the Employment Act of 1946, which established the Council of Economic Advisers and directed the Government to pursue policies that would encourage maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

Very few economists, however, have ever believed that Government can prevent mild recessions like the ones of 1949-50 or 1953-54. It is even questionable whether it is yet possible to foresee them.

Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard, is one of the country's leading economists. But he told the Senate Finance Committee last week that he didn't see this recession coming.

It is apparent now that the Council of Economic Advisers did not expect it to develop to the degree it has and that Government policies were not directed as quickly as they might have been to check it.

It also is clear that the Federal Reserve Board continued to fight inflation for some months last year after the real problem was a developing recession.

"We must have better insights before we can avert this sort of thing completely," Slichter said.

"Today we know much more than we knew a year ago, but even today we probably do not know enough to avert the sort of recession that hit us last year.

"Possibly 10 years hence we shall have improved our arrangements for checking recessions sufficiently so that we shall then be able to handle the problem which we failed to see last year and which is still beyond our powers to handle."

Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., made a similar point this week when he told the Finance Committee that "perfection in monetary management and economic stabilization, however diligently sought, is unattainable." But, like Slichter, Martin said "further progress will be made."

Slichter explained to the committee some of the difficulties. Perhaps the most significant is that this is a big country with complex and conflicting forces at work, some of an expansive and some of a contracting nature. Many of these forces are beyond the control of Government and some even beyond the influence of Government.

For example, Slichter said there were three principal influences for expansion at work in 1954 that lifted the country out of the recession: Business began accumulating in-

ventories; consumers cut their savings and began to spend at a higher rate; and housing construction spurted.

Within a year, however, the first two of these forces ceased to be stimulants, and recession might have developed again but for the fact that three new forces for expansion took over.

They were the growing expenditures by governments, booming business expenditures for plants and equipment, and a new expansion of exports.

"These three influences sustained further expansion until early in 1957," Slichter said.

After that the combination of downward pressures was stronger than the combination of upward pressures, and the forces of recession gathered strength. Three influences were particularly strong: The tight credit policy that lasted well after the recession began; the cut in defense expenditures, and the failure of the automobile market.

"The recession must be regarded not as an inevitable result of the internal operation of our economy," Slichter said, "but as the result of a mixture of bad luck and of our failure to see the problem and do something about it."

Looking back, he said, it is clear that one major cause of the recession was the decision businessmen began taking late in 1956—at the height of the boom—to reduce their appropriations for plants and equipment.

That would have been the proper time, Slichter said, if full information had been available to begin relaxing tight money policies to encourage business not to cut its rate of investment too rapidly. But everyone then was preoccupied with inflation and not recession, and it was not until November, 1957, that the Federal Reserve made its first tentative move toward credit relaxation.

Also looking back, Slichter said, it is clear that the proper time to have cut taxes was in early 1958. Such action at that time would have had a strong political as well as economic effect. It might have checked the downturn at its most rapid downward stage. It also might have set the stage for a recovery in time to save the Republicans from defeat in November. If they lose in November, they no doubt will agree with Slichter that the time to have acted was early rather than late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

PAYMENTS AND GIFTS TO ATTORNEYS BY LABOR UNIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the other day, in colloquy with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], in connection with an insertion which was made in the RECORD, I raised the point—to which he readily agreed—that his remarks should not be interpreted as meaning that all the members of the Senate select committee to investigate improper activities in the labor or management field were entirely pleased with the replies which the Attorney General of Pennsylvania, Mr. McBride, made in response to questions which were asked of him when he was a witness before our committee.

Since then, several Members of the Senate have asked me whether I could be a little more specific in connection with the reservation of such Members.

Speaking for myself primarily—although I am sure other members of our committee share these reservations—one related primarily to a question which we are now asking the Philadelphia Bar

Association to explore, and which involves, I suppose, not only Mr. McBride, but also Mr. Carroll, presently the attorney for the teamsters union, Mr. Carroll having assumed that responsibility as a member of the firm to which Mr. McBride belonged, after Mr. McBride's resignation.

We seriously doubt that attorneys, whether Mr. McBride, Mr. Carroll, or any other attorney employed by a labor union, can appropriately and ethically take funds from a union, to be used to defend officers of the union against members of such union. It seems that that is bringing into the union affairs an element of taxation without representation, the most notorious case of which is now that of the former law partner of Mr. McBride, the present attorney who represents here Mr. Cohen and his labor union.

The second point dealt with the attorney general continuing to receive a retainer fee from the union after his election as attorney general and after he had assumed that office.

Another was the Christmas bonus which he received from the union some time after he assumed the office of attorney general—a bonus of \$500, I believe, by check of the union.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Well-Tailored Labor Chief," written by Fred Othman, and published in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELL-TAILORED LABOR CHIEF
(By Fred Othman)

There is no doubt that a labor chief like Ray Cohen of Teamsters Local 107 in Philadelphia must be well-dressed.

If he's to ride around in his yachts (plural), drive Cadillacs, and rent Florida homes for the winter season, he obviously needs the glad rags to match. The question is, Who should pay for 'em? Good old Ray? Or his 14,000 dues-paying truckdrivers?

Mr. Cohen strode into the senatorial sanctum clad in an impeccably-tailored suit of blue Italian silk; he may have bought it with his own money. The sleuths of the Labor Rackets Investigating Committee interviewed his haberdasher and they came up with word of a truly magnificent wardrobe they said the union bought for its boss, but nowhere did they list any suits of silk.

Mr. Cohen's taste seemed to have run to conservative browns and grays. The loyal members bought him six gray suits, ranging in price from \$115 to \$135. They paid the tab for his four brown suits, his blue suit, his black overcoat, his brown topcoat, his gray sport coat, his tan sport coat, and his bathrobe. The Senators had the canceled checks.

Gloomily Mr. Cohen insisted that he might tend to incriminate himself if he told the truth about who bought this deluxe tailoring. He wouldn't even talk about his neckties, all but one of which verged on the superb.

For his appearance before Senator JOHN McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, and company he wore a cravat of dove gray satin, which looked like it might have been one of those \$10 jobs.

The Senatorial investigators said the members bought him 5 of these \$10 neckties, 11 less splendid ones for \$7.50 each, and 1 cheap cravat for \$5.

Committee Counsel Robert Kennedy took a good look at the blue silk socks Mr. Cohen was wearing and asked him if he had charged to the members 12 pairs of socks at \$1.20, plus two pairs of shoes at \$24.95 each, one pair at \$19.95, and three pairs of shoetrees to keep the toes from turning up.

The chunky Mr. Cohen, looking especially healthy in a fresh haircut and a deep suntan, said he couldn't discuss who bought his socks. He said if he talked about his socks, he might tend to incriminate himself.

In the winter time Mr. Cohen wears shirts with long sleeves; the evidence showed that these cost the union \$12.50 each. In summer he favors short-sleeved dress shirts and the union only had to pay \$8.95 each for them.

On the senatorial list was one item that Mr. Cohen would discuss. It seemed that Thomas D. McBride, the Pennsylvania State attorney general who once was a lawyer for Mr. Cohen, caught a marlin, which is a large fish that swims in Florida waters.

Mr. Cohen bought the counselor a plaque so that Mr. McBride could hang his fish on the parlor wall. This plaque cost \$11.62 and Mr. Cohen charged it to the union.

He said that as secretary-treasurer he was empowered to buy incidentals like plaques, without asking anybody.

Senator McCLELLAN wondered if he also considered his socks incidentals.

Mr. Cohen said he couldn't discuss that; he might tend to incriminate himself.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in connection with the article by Mr. Othman, I wish to call attention to another facet of this matter, which was not known to the members of the committee, or certainly not to this committee member, at the time when he was interrogating Mr. McBride.

The article states, in part:

On the senatorial list was one item that Mr. Cohen would discuss. It seemed that Thomas D. McBride, the Pennsylvania State attorney general who once was a lawyer for Mr. Cohen, caught a marlin, which is a large fish that swims in Florida waters.

I think most of us who have fished in Florida waters recognize that the marlin is a large fish which swims in Florida waters much more energetically than it bites our lures in Florida waters.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. CLARK. At some point in the Senator's remarks, I should like to have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. President, the article further states:

Mr. Cohen bought the counselor a plaque so that Mr. McBride could hang his fish on the parlor wall. This plaque cost \$11.62 and Mr. Cohen charged it to the union.

He said that as secretary-treasurer he was empowered to buy incidentals like plaques, without asking anybody.

Mr. President, I have had the entire article printed in the RECORD; but I wished to call particular attention to that aspect of the matter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 3 minutes, in reply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unfortunately I was engaged off the floor when my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota, made his comments; and therefore I am not even now aware of exactly what he said.

I shall confine my remarks to a brief statement. The attorney general of Pennsylvania, Thomas D. McBride, is one of the outstanding lawyers of our Commonwealth. He is a man of complete integrity. He has been the chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association. He has served as a liberal attorney general of Pennsylvania, in the best interests of our Commonwealth.

I speak with somewhat greater emotion than I would otherwise because Mr. McBride is a lifelong friend of mine. We attended law school together, at the University of Pennsylvania. Together, we have fought many a battle for liberal causes throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I reviewed with great care the record before the McClellan Committee before which Mr. McBride's name was dragged, I think quite unfairly, by members of the staff who, I am convinced, acted sincerely, but without having the slightest idea of what Mr. McBride's side of the case was, before his name appeared in public prints.

Mr. McBride immediately came to Washington and requested an opportunity to be heard—which the chairman of the committee was happy to give him.

Without solicitation from him, I requested of the chairman the opportunity to present Mr. McBride to the committee; and I did so with great pride, because Mr. McBride is a fine Christian gentleman who has served his community well.

Although I do not wish to violate the rules of the Senate, I wish to say that, personally, I resent the efforts, without cause or justification to smear him, on the floor of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 2 minutes, to comment on the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor, under the rule applicable to the morning hour, for 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. In the first place, Mr. President, I should like to clear the staff of the committee of any charge of unfairness.

Mr. Carroll, who was a law partner of Mr. McBride, said that in the controversy between the two elements in the teamsters local in Philadelphia, Mr. McBride was acting in a private capacity for Mr. Cohen, who was one of the litigants.

Mr. McBride later sent to the union a bill of \$7,500, which was paid. In connection with his receipt of the \$7,500 payment, Mr. Carroll left with the committee the impression that Mr. McBride was acting in a representative capacity, not for the union, but for Mr. Cohen, and

therefore he was not justified in sending a bill to the union. Of course, for that reason the matter was brought before the committee, which was investigating Mr. Cohen's domination of local 107.

I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania does not wish to imply that the staff of the committee was acting unfairly to Mr. McBride, although the inferences which might have been drawn as a result of Mr. Carroll's statement might have given that impression.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield briefly to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I think the record should show clearly that Mr. McBride is not now, and has not been for several years, a partner of Mr. Carroll.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator inadvertently said he was a partner. That was in the past.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Then Mr. McBride came before the committee and provided the committee evidence that Mr. Grace, who was then president of the union, came to see Mr. McBride with Mr. Cohen and employed him. That seemed to me to exonerate Mr. McBride of any wrongdoing in any way since, by being employed by the president of the union he had a right to send the bill to the union regardless of whether he had been employed by Mr. Cohen. Mr. McBride's defense rested on the authority of Mr. Grace, and therefore he was justified. I considered that he did nothing improper.

The second point of discussion is that after Mr. McBride became attorney general and assumed office on December 17, he received \$500 as a Christmas gift from local 107, which is a racket-ridden union, and he received \$1,500 in January-February at the same time he was serving as attorney general.

Mr. McBride's defense was that the \$500 Christmas gift was given to him as a result of services he had previously rendered to the union, prior to taking his oath of office as attorney general; that when the checks came in January and February for previous work, that he then appealed to the bar association of Philadelphia in order to find out whether it would be proper for him to accept future payment.

The law in Pennsylvania permits the State's attorney general to have private clients so long as there is no conflict of interest. The Bar Association of Philadelphia or it may have been of Pennsylvania, informed Mr. McBride it did not think it wise for him to continue to represent local 107. For that reason, he returned the March payment of \$1,250 from his own funds.

It seems to me he acted with sensitivity in this matter.

It is unfortunate that Mr. McBride's name was brought into the matter, but it was brought in only because the union which he had represented had become corrupt and dominated by gangsters and had become a subject of investigation.

I think Mr. McBride acted properly in bringing the matter to the attention of the State bar. I think he acted with

sensitivity in returning the money. I have no criticism of Mr. McBride. I think he acted in a perfectly proper way.

I would join the Senator from Pennsylvania in clearing him of any wrongdoing in any way. At least in my own opinion, quite the reverse is true.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his candid, frank, and forthright statement. I should like to make two further points for the record, which will take only about a minute.

In the first place, Mr. McBride was hired by the union, and the union was the plaintiff in the lawsuit which he instituted. In the second place Mr. McBride was the first attorney general for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the past 50 years, and probably before that, who has undertaken voluntarily to give up his entire private practice in order to serve his whole time as attorney general for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He is not a rich man. He did so at great personal sacrifice. Instead of being smeared, he should be held up to young men who aspire to be lawyers as an example of what a member of the bar should be.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to take a moment to make the RECORD perfectly clear that by inserting Mr. Othman's article in the RECORD I did not believe, and I do not now believe, I was smearing the attorney general of Pennsylvania. Personally, I had never even heard the name of the attorney general of Pennsylvania until I walked into the committee room and found our committee staff was interrogating him. I said to my colleague on the committee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], "Who is this witness?" He said, "The attorney general of the State of Pennsylvania."

I agree with my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. I do not think we should condemn the staff for unfairness in its work in this connection. I think our staff would have been derelict had it detoured around the attorney general simply because it found his name was involved. Wherever the evidence leads, let it lead. Whatever the evidence proves, let it prove. I suggest that the public or anyone else interested read the entire evidence before the select committee involving the attorney general, and each can make up his own mind. I simply said, as for me, I had some reservations because we did not have material before us which, in my opinion, clearly justified the connection between Cohen, and his nefarious record, and the fact that Mr. McBride was his attorney.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it should be pointed out there is no intent to smear the attorney general, Mr. McBride, and certainly no one on the staff should be censured for the conclusion that the facts were such that Mr. McBride should appear. The leadership of local 107 in Philadelphia was guilty of many, many offenses—

Mr. MUNDT. As was evidenced by the fact that they all took the fifth amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I was astonished that all Mr. McBride's former clients in this union took the fifth amendment. I did not like it then, and I do not like it now.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield at some convenient point?

Mr. MUNDT. I have the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Local 107 was composed of corrupt persons, a number of whom took the fifth amendment. This was the same segment of the union which had employed Mr. McBride over a period of time. It was unavoidable that the facts came out and his name was mentioned.

As the distinguished Senator from South Dakota stated, there was no effort to drag in an official of a sovereign State. It was one of those cases where the facts had to be disclosed so they could speak for themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend? There is conversation in the Chamber, and it is impossible to hear the Senator addressing the Chair. Will those in the rear of the Chamber kindly desist from conversation or retire to the cloakrooms? The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield in a moment.

I wish to say I completely agree with what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said. It is not an answer, wherever the facts lead, to try to cry "smear" because the facts came out. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania was not present in the Chamber when I said a moment ago that when I walked into the committee room I did not know who was sitting there as a witness. I asked who the witness was, and I was told he was the attorney general of Pennsylvania.

We have a chance to set the record straight. I am glad the attorney general came before the committee to testify. Even though his explanations were, in my opinion, not altogether satisfactory and exonerating. I have only suggested that all Members of the Senate read the full hearings when printed, and I hope the people of the country can have an opportunity to read them.

I believe there is posed a very real problem of legal ethics, from the standpoint of whether the dues of a union member should be used to support an attorney who takes a position which we believe is detrimental to the interests of the union member. That is the question at issue.

Mr. McBride happened to be the union attorney at that time. Mr. Carroll is the attorney now. The issue remains the same now as it was then. I think it is something to which the American Bar

Association and the Philadelphia Bar Association should devote their attention, so that some guidance may be given to the attorneys of the country and some aid to union members who are helpless to get lawyers on their own account, but who pay dues to dishonest labor leaders to employ attorneys to protect the labor leaders, against the best interests of their own union members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I be recognized in my own right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to make a few brief comments.

First, I intended no attack on the staff. I have no doubt the staff was doing only what it was directed to do. I think it is unfortunate, as a part of the procedures not only before this committee but before many others, that publicity is given to certain situations, which results in attacks on the integrity of various individuals before they have an opportunity to advise the staff or indeed the committee itself of their own defense to the charge made.

In the second place, I hold no brief for Teamsters Local Union, No. 107. It is racket-dominated. The criminal laws, in my judgment, should be invoked against it.

I think the committee rendered a very real service in bringing out the extent of gangsterism involved in that case.

In the third place, I had hoped guilt by association had left this floor a year or two ago. Apparently it has not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION BENEFIT PLANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, S. 2888, be laid before the Senate, and that, notwithstanding the expiration of the morning hour at 1 o'clock, its further consideration be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2888) to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the order entered by the Senate last night the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is to be recognized to complete his statement. I hope we may reach a vote on the pending amendment early in the afternoon. I should be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum for the Senator, if he would like to have that done. I would not do so with any desire for delay. I know none of the Senators who are spending the day here want a delay. I hope Senators will be cooperative and try to pass on as many of the amendments as possible.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum before the Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Before the Senator from Nebraska proceeds, let the Chair state that the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] designated as "K".

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In order that Senators may have some idea about our plans for today, I wish to make a brief statement.

After consulting with the minority leader, I am hopeful that at the conclusion of the statement of the Senator from Nebraska, the minority leader can explain his amendment, the chairman of the subcommittee can make such response as he desires, and we can have a yea and nay vote on the pending Knowland amendment.

I understand that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has some amendments which he desires to offer following action on the Knowland amendment. We expect to have yea and nay votes on those amendments.

I should like to have Members of the Senate on notice as to our plans. I hope Senators will be as cooperative as possible, in order that we may make some progress today toward completing consideration of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In order that my colleagues may have a better idea of what timing to expect today, I will tell the majority leader that I have three amendments on which I intend to speak at length. I also intend to speak on another subject, which is related to the pending bill. I think it is only fair to inform my colleagues of my plans, so they will know, with completeness, what to expect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Since last Thursday I have observed that certain Senators are not eager to proceed as rapidly as possible with consideration of the pending bill. There is nothing anyone can do about that. If the Senator from Arizona desires to discuss another subject, he can discuss it, and keep us here all day. On one or two previous occasions the Senate has been kept in session during the evening.

That is beyond the control of the Senator from Texas. There is nothing he can do about it. All he can do is to inform the Membership on both sides of the aisle of such agreement as he is able to reach

with the minority leader. While it is my purpose, hope, and desire to complete action upon the pending bill and proceed on Monday to the consideration of the military-pay bill, which is very important to the country, in the light of the announcement of the Senator from Arizona, I rather doubt that such procedure will be possible.

I have heard that certain Senators would like to have consideration of the bill continued over the week end, in order that they may hear from the country.

I am a realist. I know that it does not require many Senators to insure delay over the week end in the consideration of the bill. All I wish Senators to know is what the majority leader and the minority leader have agreed to. We had hoped that the Senate might be able to reach a vote on the Knowland amendment and a vote on the Smith amendments, perhaps, this afternoon. I should like to have votes on other amendments. If any Senator desires to prolong the discussion, of course, we cannot have such votes.

I am prepared, if Senators tell me that they will not allow votes, to move that the Senate take a recess, because I realize that we cannot force Senators to vote when they are not ready to vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senate and to the distinguished majority leader that we have discussed the question of making progress in the consideration of the bill. I told him that I was prepared to move ahead with respect to the pending amendment as soon as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska had concluded his remarks; and that, in my judgment, without prolonged debate, we could reach a vote on the pending Knowland amendment, and proceed with the consideration of other amendments.

There were four votes yesterday. I believe that the Senate made substantial progress yesterday.

It is my judgment that we shall also have the opportunity during the day to vote on the first two Smith amendments, and perhaps one further amendment.

I did express to the majority leader my judgment, after some consultation, that I doubted whether it would be possible to complete consideration of the bill today. It is my belief that it would be possible to complete consideration of the bill on Monday.

That is the situation. I shall certainly try to facilitate the voting on at least three or four amendments during the day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's assurance and cooperation. In the words of the distinguished minority leader when he was majority leader, "We will go along and see what progress we can make."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking as a Senator who has five or six amendments on the desk which have not yet been offered, I

should like to add one personal observation to the discussion with respect to the schedule.

First of all, I completely associate myself with the combined views, as I understand them, of the majority leader and the minority leader, to the effect that there should be some votes today. Inasmuch as the minority leader has an amendment pending on which he desires a vote today, I certainly believe that we should have it speedily, as it has been thoroughly discussed.

The Senator from New Jersey has several amendments on which he is ready to have a vote. I am perfectly willing to have one or two of my amendments voted upon today.

I have been a Member of the Senate for a number of years, and have never yet engaged in a filibuster. I have never said that I would not do so. I might be needed into doing so at some time, but I have no intention of doing so upon this occasion, because I know the majority leader well enough to realize that he will not try to ramrod through a vote today on a bill which should receive some further consideration.

I should like to associate myself with one other comment the majority leader made. I believe there is some merit to his suggestion of letting the country respond over the weekend to the proposed legislation. I am not sure whether it was an original idea with the majority leader; but, whether it was or not, I believe the suggestion has merit, and I should like to emphasize it and I should like to share it.

I share it for one reason, Mr. President. Yesterday noon I addressed a luncheon at the Shoreham Hotel. There were present about 500 people, and, as at all luncheons, some questions were asked. I might say that it was a luncheon of the national convention of a retail merchants' association. Many of those attending the luncheon told me they were very much interested in the Curtis bill. I said, "The Curtis bill? What is that?"

They said, "The Curtis bill against secondary boycotts and organization picketing."

I said, "You are here just at the right time. We will be discussing it for the next day or two."

They asked me some questions about it, and I discussed it with them as best I could. I do not know whether it is only this association which is interested in the Curtis bill. Certainly I believe that there are retail merchants in other States who did not attend the convention but who should have an opportunity to write to Senators and tell them their views on the Curtis bill. It may be that there are opponents of the Curtis bill, certainly in labor circles. Nevertheless, all of them should have a chance to express themselves. Those opposed should have the opportunity to say, "We do not want the Curtis bill."

Therefore I should like to recommend to the majority leader that at least on the Curtis amendment, in which there seems to be national interest, we give the merchants of America, employees, and all other persons who are interested in it, an opportunity to convey to the

Senate their views on the Curtis amendment, and on the pending bill which is a measure of such great importance. Therefore I believe there is some merit to the suggestion of the able majority leader, that we ought at least to give the people of the country an opportunity to counsel with the Senate, pro and con, on the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield so I may comment on the statement of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the counsel of the Senator from South Dakota. I have great respect for his opinions. I also have great respect for the people of the country, and I have no fear of their expressing their opinion, just as the retail merchants have expressed their own opinion to me. I doubt seriously that any organization can whip up enough pressure to change any Senator's viewpoint. Recently I talked with the representative of some retail organization in my State, who expressed an interest in the Curtis amendment. I told him of the plan for orderly procedure which a majority of the Senate wished to follow.

It was only a few days ago that the distinguished minority leader was talking about postponing a vote on the community facilities bill in the Senate, insisting that it should go over until at least after the Easter recess, because Senators had not had a chance to study and digest the report on the bill, although the report was then on the desks of the Members of the Senate.

I concur in what the minority leader said about the importance of the report of a standing committee being made available to all Members of the Senate. I concurred in it even before he said it. For that reason I had the report ready before we undertook to vote upon the bill.

That is all we are asking in this instance.

I favor legislation in this field. I said I favored it as early in the session as February in a speech I made in this city. At that time I included it as a part of the program I thought Congress should enact at this session.

I have had numerous conversations with the chairmen of the committees, and I have been assured, both by the minority and the majority Members, that they would take action on some proposed legislation.

I would remind the Senator and I would remind the country that there should be no partisanship in this field. It would be contrary to fact to blame the majority party for an alleged failure to act to expose the evils which exist in a few unions in the labor movement. The majority leader, with the cooperation of the minority leader brought before this body the resolution of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives]. The resolution provided for an equally balanced committee to make these studies. The Senate adopted that resolution. We provided it with all the funds it asked for. For 14 months we

have had the diligent work of the chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], aided by its vice chairman, the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], and each of the eight members of that committee, exposing what needed to be exposed.

Only 10 days ago the committee filed its report. The hearings on that report will begin a week from next Monday. If all the folks who feel that legislation must be enacted this week will go to the subcommittee room, in the old Supreme Court Chamber, when the hearing opens, and make their recommendations, I know they will be cordially received and carefully considered. I have every confidence in the honesty and integrity and sincerity and decency of the members of that subcommittee.

I believe the committee will report a bill to the Senate; that it will be considered by the Senate, and that we will have before us a report as demanded by the minority leader in the case of the community facilities bill. We will have followed orderly procedure, and the American people can then look at our record and judge us in respect thereto.

I do not think we want to take the work the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from New York, and other Senators have done for 14 months, and then have offered a bunch of amendments, which in many technical respects are imperfect, I am told, and to have them offered from the floor and adopted. At least I hope we will not do that.

I hope just as strongly that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from California, and any other Senators who have long been interested in this field and in effecting reforms will make their recommendations to the committee. I am sure the committee will act expeditiously and will report to the Senate a fair and equitable proposal, upon which we can then act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield so that I may address a question to the majority leader?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to say first of all, as a prelude to my question, that the Senator from South Dakota, after sitting in the hearings on an average of 30 hours a week, week after week, for the duration of the committee, on January 16 submitted five bills to the committee. They have had them until now, attached, I hope, to the letter I wrote, asking that they be considered by the committee. I received the courtesy of a reply, but no meeting date was fixed. I was told that the bills would have to be delayed for some time. I am still hoping.

The question I have to ask of the majority leader is this: Does the majority leader believe sufficiently in the integrity of his prediction, which has been endorsed unanimously by the members of his party in the Senate, save one, that the Senate will be able to pass this kind of legislation in time to enable the House to get it through its Rules Committee and to act on it, so that the proposed

legislation may be completed at this session of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The answer to that question is yes. I think the quickest way to get the legislation passed is to quit discussing what the House will do and go on and pass a bill in the Senate. The Senator from Texas is ready to have the roll called on the bill before us today. We will act on it and pass the first part of the President's program and start hearings just as soon as we can get the witnesses before the committee a week from next Monday.

Mr. MUNDT. What would the Senator think of the suggestion of putting the package together, that is, not merely passing one portion which the labor unions want and rejecting everything else. If his time schedule is going to work out as happily and as gratuitously as he hopes and predicts, it would seem to me we might expedite matters if we could do it as a package.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has expressed himself on that point several times. He is not seeking the passage of a bill because the labor unions want it. I did not know it was a bill that only the labor unions wanted. I understood from my friend the distinguished minority leader that perhaps one of the mistakes which was made when the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted was that the working people of the country were required to take the anti-Communist oath, but that employers were not required to take the same oath. Since then certain persons have pointed to the inequity which existed in that instance.

I thought that when the bill was reported it was a bill which had been endorsed by the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, and at least some of the minority members of the committee, and that the bill was in the interest of all parties.

I doubted the advisability of eliminating the employer group from it and letting it apply only to the employees. I heard that fully and thoroughly debated, but I thought the Senate acted wisely in refusing to apply one rule to the goose and another to the gander.

I think the Senate has acted wisely in not legislating on the 35 amendments and not adopting them as a part of the bill.

If the committee can be trusted—and I believe it can—and if the committee system is a good system, to begin with—and I think it is—I think that we should act on the bill immediately. If we must wait until Monday, there is nothing I can do about it. We have been debating the bill since Wednesday. I do not think it will be possible to cause any Senators to turn a flip-flop because they receive a few telegrams. I think the average citizen is willing to leave this matter to the judgment of his Senator.

When I told a representative from my State that I would be glad to see the Curtis proposal receive the consideration of the subcommittee, he seemed to think that that was rather orderly procedure. As a matter of fact, the contractors of my State are sending me telegrams now saying, in effect, "Please do not take

action on the secondary-boycott amendment." They are calling long distance.

Mr. Duddleston, executive secretary of the Associated General Contractors of Houston, Tex., called to say that he understood Senator Smith of New Jersey had submitted an amendment relating to the welfare fund bill which would relax the restrictions on secondary boycotts. He said he understood the committee had not held any hearings on that subject this year, and he certainly hoped the amendment would not be adopted now.

I think that is illustrative of what happens when we get into the complex field of labor relations and attempt to write a bill on the floor without having had hearings.

I ask Senators: Please wait 1 week. That is not long to wait. Let us act on the first part of this bill. Then let us start next week to write another bill.

I assure Senators with all the sincerity at my command that I have no intention of delaying the matter. I have supported the Senator from Arkansas. I have supported the Senator from New York. I think they are entitled to have their recommendations heard by the committee. I think the committee is entitled to consider all the proposals.

I was informed some time ago that the Senator from South Dakota introduced four or five bills himself concerning the investigation, before the chairman introduced his bill. I think the proposals of the Senator from South Dakota should be carefully considered. But the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] introduced his bill only a week or 10 days ago.

After we have created a select committee, on which almost a million dollars have been spent, and after the chairman has made a report containing specific recommendations—a forthright report—which has gone all over the land, and after he has introduced a bill to carry out the recommendations, I think it would be most inconsiderate for us to say that we will not let the committee consider the matter because we have prepared a bunch of amendments of our own which we want the Senate to take up and work on and because we want to force the Senate to adopt them on the Senate floor, now or never.

The Senator from California said a bill of the importance of the community facilities bill should not be considered until Senators had a chance to study the committee report and digest it. That was the burden of his argument. That was the moment when the maximum of cohesion prevailed on the Republican side.

I listened, somewhat disappointed, to the report over the radio in Texas. But the cohesion which the Senator complained of on our side yesterday was very much in evidence, because there had not been enough time to study the report.

The Senator prevailed to the extent of two or three votes. Finally the rather unique, unusual procedure was followed of saying to the majority, which is responsible for the scheduling of the con-

sideration of proposed legislation, that the minority would take over that function. I remind the Senator from California, as he reminded me yesterday, that I never attempted to schedule proposed legislation when he was the majority leader. But the Senator from California did, and he did it effectively. He asked that the community facilities bill be moved back to April 14, so that there could be a reasonable time to study the report.

I am not asking the Senate to move this proposal back 2 weeks; I am asking to have it moved up to a week from Monday. Then we can come forward with a report on the Senator's bill. There can be a report on the bill introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and reports on the bills of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

In this field there is enough credit for all. But let us not shoot from the hip in order to get a few headlines today. It is known that the McClellan committee has made its recommendations. We know, from what the Senator from Arkansas has said, that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will act on them, or else he will make a motion to discharge that committee from the consideration of the bill.

If that is not enough assurance for Senators, I do not know how they can be given any more. I served in the House with JOHN McCLELLAN. I have served in the Senate with him. He is a fearless man, a man of his word. He is experienced in this field. The Senator from Arkansas has spent many hours—morning, afternoon, and night—in his study of these problems.

Should some people now try to grab the ball—as some of the slick magazines would say, "Seize the issue"—and say to JOHN McCLELLAN, "Get off the field and back on the sidelines. I am Mr. Labor. I am the expert in this field. I want these amendments rammed through now without hearings, with no right of petition and no right for witnesses to be heard; we will even criticize anyone who expresses his views on them. We are going to debate them on the floor now. Monday? No. We cannot wait until then. It is now or never."

I assure Senators that I want to be bipartisan in this matter. I will not commit myself in advance to support of the McClellan bill. I have not seen it. But I have full confidence in the integrity and judiciousness of the Senator from Arkansas.

I will say again to the Senate what I said before I brought up the pending bill: We will have legislation in this field, if I have any voice in this body. I will do what I can, so far as one Senator is concerned, to make certain that the committee reports such a bill, that the policy committee clears it immediately—I can speak for only one member of the policy committee—and to see, if the Senate votes on it afterward, that every Senator has had an opportunity to be heard. The fact that the name of the Senator from Nebraska or the name of the Senator from South Dakota

is on the bill will not deter me for a moment.

I voted for the Case bill; I voted for the Taft-Hartley bill. I voted to override the veto by my own President.

I do not know whether it is early or late in the session. I have learned that a majority which is determined enough can always work its will. I am anxious to have legislation enacted; but I am also equally anxious to make certain that every person affected gets his fair shake of the dice.

I do not want to have a bill reported and then have it rammed through the Senate with 15, 20, 30, or 36 previously unconsidered amendments added to it, when people are saying to me what the group of contractors said; when people say what the railroad brotherhoods have said. They want to have a chance to be heard on the subject. They are saying, in effect, "You are making the bill applicable to us, but we have not had a chance to be heard, and you will not wait until a week from Monday."

I will not be a party to such procedure. I remember that some of my colleagues once before forced action. They demanded immediate action. They were very vociferous, very effective, and very eloquent Senators. They attempted to persuade me to let the Senate act immediately.

I said, "I think we ought to have a committee study this matter. Let everyone who wishes to be heard be heard. It can stand the searchlight. Then let the committee report."

I went to the Senator from California; and he and I formulated a resolution which provided for a committee to take jurisdiction.

That is what we have done in this field.

Why spend all this money, and have the committee hold long sessions, and then make its recommendations, if the chairman will not even have a chance to discuss the proposals with the legislative committee which has jurisdiction over them? Why must we act "now or never"? Why must the matter come up on April 27, instead of May 5?

Of course it will take time; anything worth while takes time. But I am not one of those who say that Congress must adjourn by July 31. I am interested in going home, and I know other Senators are interested in going home—for various reasons. [Laughter.] But I am not so anxious to go home that I will move that the Senate adjourn sine die when problems which should be faced up to have not been disposed of.

If I concluded, as a result of taking a schoolboy approach, that any measure to be passed by the Senate later than April 27 would not have a chance to be passed by the other body at this session, such an attitude would not be worthy of the 20 years I have spent in the two Houses. I have seen very important legislative measures enacted during the last month of a session, and so has the Senator from South Dakota. I have seen some of the most controversial measures passed in the last week of a session.

Hearings have been held on these subjects; there is a background of hearings in regard to them.

Some ask, "When are you going to start hearings?"

The hearings have already been started, and at them the Secretary of Labor and the head of a great labor organization have been heard.

The Senator has told his colleagues that he will limit the hearings to 3 weeks, if that is at all possible. If the Senate will give its consent that the committee meet during the afternoons of the days when the Senate is in session, I am sure the committee will meet in the mornings and in the afternoons—and also in the evenings, if that is necessary.

That is reasonable and fair. We do not insist that all the Democrats are patriotic and know it all, and that all the Republicans are bad. I do not think that is correct; I know there are a substantial number of Republicans who are intelligent [laughter], and I know that all of them are always patriotic.

So the Senator should not complain because the Democrats exercise some intelligence.

Let us work together on this matter, and let us try to do things properly, and give all sides an opportunity to be heard—the employers, the employees, and the representatives of the people. Then let us write a bill, and consider it on the floor of the Senate, and let Senators who may wish to do so submit amendments.

The amendments can first be submitted to the committee; then the committee will be able to say, after it has reported the bill, "Yes; we considered them."

But a bill written entirely or substantially on the floor of the Senate would not be effective. Instead, it would be a lawyer's paradise. It would not work.

When I voted for the Hartley bill—and I remind the Senator that some persons thought it was a much stronger bill than the finally enacted Taft-Hartley bill—I was of the opinion that that bill and, later, the Taft-Hartley bill, when it finally was enacted over the President's veto, were two of the most thorough pieces of legislation ever introduced. I am sure many amendments were proposed. Many were discussed in the committee. Many were adopted; and many were voted down.

Hearings have been held on this bill. The Senator should not take the position that all proposals in the field of labor must be voted on immediately.

After the Senate had proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which contains the provisions recommended by the President, I was the most shocked Member of this body when I found that the minority leader was going to propose that the bill be rewritten, by means of 11, 12, or 15 amendments. I knew he was independent, and I commend him for it; but I did not know he was 15 or 16 times that independent [laughter], and that he was going to propose that an entire, complex labor-relations bill be written on this floor. Of course, I know it now. But in the light of my experience, I would do the same thing again, because I think that bill should have been brought up for consideration.

Furthermore, the other bills which were placed on the calendar a few days

before the Senate adjourned for the Easter recess are going to be brought up at this session. We have many of them to be brought up. One of them, in my opinion—if I have anything to do with the matter—is going to be a bill in the general labor field.

I do not expect to persuade the Senator from South Dakota. I have served a long time with him, and I do not know anyone for whom I have more respect, or anyone with whom I work more cooperatively, or anyone whom I know to be more diligent or more concerned with the welfare of the country. But in this connection, I think he is like Bob Taylor's goat: he has already voted. [Laughter.]

I am not trying to persuade him; but I am trying to tell him what I have made up my mind to try to do—and not in exchange for something that I would ask him to be willing to do.

I realize the forces which confront us. Last Thursday, I realized that it would be unlikely that the Senate would be able to complete its action on the bill this week—although I had hoped it could do so.

The responsibility for delaying the bill will not be on the shoulders of the Members of the majority party, in this instance. Instead, it will be on the shoulders of those who demand a live quorum which takes 47 minutes to obtain.

When we have concluded our action on this bill, I am going to urge every member of the committee to make haste, in the traditional American manner, to give everyone who desires to be heard a hearing, and then to prepare a bill on the subject. I am going to ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to participate and I hope the bill will be a bipartisan bill. Then if Senators do not like the bill, they can submit amendments to it. The Senator from Arkansas has stated that he will offer some proposals, and all other Senators can do likewise.

I think such a bill is likely to be passed by both Houses and be signed by the President. That process is far more likely—far more likely than any action taken in 2 days on the floor of the Senate—to result in the enactment of an effective bill. I may be wrong; but if I am, time will tell.

I do not know what the other body will do. I never speak for it. I do not even know what this body will do. [Laughter.]

But if we carefully consider the matter, and act with reasonable unanimity; and if we are fair; and if we do not lay ourselves open to the charge that we would not even allow those who are interested to be heard, but that we took the attitude, "It is now or never", I believe that the progress we desire will be made.

Let me say that, so far as I am concerned, I rather doubt that all the telephone calls and all the letters which could possibly be sent to Senators between now and Monday would make any Senator reverse his position. I have too much confidence in the Senate and in Senators to believe that the application of a "blow torch" to them would cause them to change their opinions.

So long as the people of the country know that equitable and fair Members of the Senate are going to act fairly, the people will be willing to trust Senators; and I believe that is the way all Senators feel.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, and then I shall yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, who has outlined his point of view, I should like to say that there is no parallel between the situation in connection with so-called community facilities bill and the situation regarding the presently proposed legislation.

In the first place, no report on the community facilities bill was available until the morning when that \$1 billion bill was to be called before the Senate. To the Senator from Texas and his party, \$1 billion may be small change; but it is still a great deal of money insofar as I am concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like the Senator from Nebraska to permit me to proceed, first, for just a moment further.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. One billion dollars is still a great deal of money, so far as we are concerned and so far as the American people as a whole are concerned.

In this case, a bill has been reported by the committee, and is now before the Senate. It is completely in keeping with the Senate rules for Senators to offer amendments to the bill. As a matter of fact, in the Senate there is not a rule of germaneness, such as there is in the House of Representatives; and in the Senate amendments of this kind can be submitted to any bill.

But this bill has been reported by the committee to which proposed legislation dealing with this general subject has regularly been sent. The fact of the matter is that proposed legislation in this field has been before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during practically the entire 2 years of the 85th Congress.

The Senator from Nebraska read on the floor a letter which he had received in response to a request, of a year ago, for the holding of hearings on his bill which deals with some very important subjects.

The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has introduced proposed legislation which deals with an important phase of the labor-management relations field, and his bill has been before that committee; but there has not been the slightest indication that a hearing date would be set, or that the Senator was to be given the courtesy of a hearing. Instead, there was a complete "brushoff."

Other Senators—including the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], one of our ablest Members—have had proposed legislation before the committee, of which he is a member; but, as I understand, the committee has not—or it has not thus far, at least—held hearings on those bills or reported them.

The minority leader—who certainly does not claim that, because he holds that position, he is entitled to preferential treatment—introduced in January, and it has been pending since that time, a bill to protect the rank-and-file members of labor unions from the kinds of coercion and corruption which have been indicated in the course of the hearings held by the McClellan committee. But until these amendments were submitted, there was not the slightest indication that there would be any acceleration of pace, so as to give the Senate an opportunity to act on proposed legislation on this subject before the 85th Congress adjourns sine die.

We are in the second year of the 85th Congress. These matters are of importance, not only to the Members of the Senate, not only to the Members of the House of Representatives, but I believe to the American people as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have great respect and friendship for the distinguished majority leader. I think we have had as pleasant a relationship across the aisle as any two persons holding these positions ever had. I am glad we have been able to get, in the last couple of days, some of the assurances which have been given in regard to other bills on this subject. But the Senate of the United States has a responsibility. We are acting within our rights. In my opinion the amendments have not been ill considered. They have been very thoroughly considered. I believe the Members of the Senate are familiar with the subject matter of the amendments. I have here a report from the committee dealing with only one phase of the recommendations of the President of the United States, which also came to the Congress on the 23d of January.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the distinguished Senator from Texas is so certain we will have before us legislative proposals on which we can act at this session, I ask him, since some mention was made that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, is he confident we can clear legislation through both Houses of Congress, if the consideration of the proposed legislation is postponed until the 10th day of June, when there will be before the Senate the other proposed legislation, of which we have been assured? If so, we shall be able to act not merely on the first phase, but we can be sure there will be a vehicle upon which other phases of the question, equally important, both in the eyes of the President of the United States and in the eyes of a number of Members of Congress, may be disposed of. As the Senator stated, he was also deeply concerned that we should

have a chance to enact such legislation at this session.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First of all, the Senator sets up a strawman and then knocks him down. No one has ever said that \$1 billion is not a lot of money. I think most people recognize, that \$1 billion is a lot of money.

Secondly, the Senator from California did not want the community facilities bill considered because a report on the contents of that bill was available only on the day the bill was called up. The point I wish to make is that there is no report available to the Senate on the contents of any of the Senator's amendments and there cannot be unless and until the committee acts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We do have—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me complete my reply; then I will yield to the Senator. He has been courteous in yielding to me, but he chose his time. I shall be through shortly.

There is no reason why we should delay action on the bill. If the Senator wants a vehicle, he has the vehicle of moving to discharge the committee, or of tying his proposals to another bill.

The Senator from Texas does not guarantee a bill will be approved and reported by the committee or passed by the Senate. He is not predicting it will pass the other body. He has expressed his hope, and he is going to do everything he can to have legislation on the subject considered on this floor. He is going to do everything he can to have fair and equitable legislation passed.

What the other body does is its own responsibility. The Senator from Texas is of the opinion that the other body will give more consideration to a bill, and have more respect for it, if its Members realize that it was evolved through orderly procedure, after all sides had an opportunity to be heard. That is merely an expression of opinion on the part of the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas cannot underwrite a bill. The Senator from California has not obtained any assurance from me about the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Texas likes to take credit for everything he can, but the Senator from Texas stated last February, to an assembled group in the city of Washington, before he moved the consideration of the bill, that he thought we had to have comprehensive legislation on this subject. All he is asking is that the appropriate committee shall be given an opportunity to accord a hearing to people who are involved, and that the committee act promptly. I think that is reasonable.

I do not criticize any Senator who desires to offer amendments today, or Monday, or at any other time. But the Senator from Texas has expressed the view that we are more likely to get a bill which is fair and equitable by the procedural route which he has mentioned. The Senator from Texas may be mistaken. Only time will tell.

I assure anyone who has any doubts, and who thinks I am going to stand in

the way of any proposed legislation on this subject reaching the floor, that that is not the case. Time and time again I have tried to make that clear. I think my position is clear.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. Ives. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield on a point which has just been made in the colloquy?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. Ives. I should like to comment briefly on what has just been said, for several reasons. In the first place, I believe I am the Member of the Senate who first introduced a bill on the various subjects to which reference has been made. I introduced my bill on January 9 of this year. Also, I released for publication on November 20 the various bills which had been prepared.

I desire to inform the Senate briefly what the situation is and what has happened, because I believe Senators should be made acquainted with what has occurred. If anybody should be clamoring for consideration of his own legislative proposals, it is I. I have had in mind proposed legislation in the field ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, and that now covers a period of 12 years. Yet I know what it takes to write legislation in this field, and what it takes to have it considered.

I have not been clamoring on this subject, and I will tell the Senate why. In the first place, the so-called McClellan committee has been investigating rack-ets. That came about through a recommendation in the form of resolutions on the part of the Senator from Arkansas and myself, which were combined in such a way that a single committee was created.

I know how the distinguished Senator from Arkansas feels about this matter. I rise in part to speak in his behalf, to say things which he would not say himself because of his modesty.

In my judgment, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is chairman of the select committee, is indeed, a great American. He has done a magnificent job in the work and chairmanship of the select committee. I am sure the members of the committee recognize that in the consideration of legislation in this field, as chairman of the committee he has carried a certain amount of responsibility. I know I realize that. The chairman has produced certain results which are most valuable, on which the report we are discussing is based. I am referring to the report of the select committee, not the report on the particular bill now before the Senate.

The chairman has asked that the Senate not take action on the amendments to the pending bill. The regular committee, the standing Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, could not consider these matters and report a bill, if we had any respect for the chairman of the committee, until he set forth his own program and we knew what it was. Because of the heavy load he was carrying as chairman of the committee,

he was not in a position to prepare proposed legislation and introduce it until after the report of the select committee. That was made clear at the end of March. Because we all had to play a part in it, we all know what a job it was drafting that report. Recommendations in that report were discussed yesterday between the minority leader and myself.

I wish to say to the Senate, and particularly to my friends on this side of the aisle, that if we have any respect whatever—and I am sure we all have—for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, we will heed his warning and advice with regard to this proposed legislation. I heard the Senator from Arkansas stand on this floor yesterday and literally plead with the Senate not to take action on amendments of the nature proposed until after such matters had been considered by the standing Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

With all due respect to my good friend from California—and he and I are good friends, and have been friends since I came to serve in the Senate, when the Senator from California was already serving—I must point out there are defects in the draftsmanship of the amendments he is proposing.

We have been plagued enough in the matter of draftsmanship with respect to the Taft-Hartley Act. As the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] pointed out yesterday, that act was drafted in part on the floor of the Senate. To be sure, some of the bad draftsmanship which was the result of framing the bill in that manner was eliminated in the conference committee, but we could not eliminate it all, and it has been plaguing us ever since. Let us not repeat that experience.

I desire to see passed a good bill dealing with this subject matter. I am just as strongly in favor of the amendments in principle, not the particular amendments as framed, but the amendments in principle, as is anyone else. A good many of them have been covered in the measure I have proposed. In principle, I am as strongly in favor of the suggested provisions, as my good friend, the Senator from California, or any other Member of the Senate. I favor them exactly as much. I think we all favor them. There is no exception in regard to racketeers. We want to clean out the racketeers, the thugs, the goons and criminals who have penetrated the labor organizations. We must do it. Otherwise, the future of our country may be in considerable doubt.

I am very fearful with regard to this subject. We cannot take action too soon. But the process being advocated by my good friend from California will result in exactly no action.

We should follow the advice of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and consider the pending bill as it has been reported. We should dispose of the one bill, keeping it in the shape in which it now appears before the Senate.

I have confidence, whether anybody else has or not, in the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the distinguished Senator from Alabama

[Mr. HILL], and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I have already indicated my confidence in the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I have confidence in the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I might say I think I have some confidence in my own integrity.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to say that I, too, have confidence in the Senators he has named. The Senator does not stand alone.

Mr. IVES. I hope the Senator has confidence in me, also, because I have a pledge to make. If the Senators who have given such a notice get sick and die, or otherwise pass out of the picture, and I am still around, I am going to move to discharge the committee, if nothing happens.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have confidence in the Senator from New York, also.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator very much. I am glad somebody has confidence in me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? May I express my confidence in the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have been yielding all day. I shall be glad to continue to yield.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am not quite through, if the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me.

I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska may be permitted to yield the floor to me temporarily, until this matter is disposed of, which will save the Senate a great deal of time in asking the Senator to yield on all these questions. I make that request with the understanding that the Senator from Nebraska will retain his right to the floor as soon as this matter is resolved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I think it will save a little time to follow that procedure.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not want to yield the floor until all of these questions are settled. My term might expire.

Mr. IVES. How about my term?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us have a clear understanding. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from New York asks unanimous consent to temporarily hold the floor, in order that he may yield to various Senators, with the understanding that the Senator from Nebraska does not lose his right to the floor, and will have the right to the floor as soon as the Senator from New York has completed his statement.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. May I inquire of the Senator from New York in regard to the bill which I introduced to take care of the no-man's land situation, or the twilight-zone situation, which is described in two ways?

Mr. IVES. The no-man's-land case. Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from New York think that is an important piece of proposed legislation with regard to the labor-union men and the many small businesses throughout the country which have almost been compelled to cease operations because they cannot get relief?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in that regard I wish to say that I proposed legislation on that subject in 1953. I believe the Senator proposed legislation after that time. That is definitely an important matter. That is one of the important things which has to be put into any legislation which is passed, if we are to have a comprehensive bill. That matter has no business in the bill now pending before the Senate.

The very fact that my distinguished friend from Utah has introduced a bill on this subject, and the fact that I have introduced a bill on the subject, as well as the fact that the bills differ not in purpose but in the way they are written and their approach, is a demonstration that the questions involved should be considered by a standing committee of the Senate before the Senate comes to a vote on them. We should not be legislating on such a subject at this time in this way.

Mr. WATKINS. How much times does my distinguished friend from New York think the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should have on the issue, since the Senator introduced his bill in 1953?

Mr. IVES. Let me tell the Senator something about that situation. The bill which I introduced was incorporated in an omnibus bill which was reported in 1953. That bill, as the Senator will recall, was recommitted. I am not responsible for the recommitment of that bill in any way, shape or manner.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand. I have been advised, and I think I have received true advice, that certain members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have been completely frustrated in their attempts to get action on this type of legislation.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator mean this year, or heretofore?

Mr. WATKINS. Not only this year, but ever since the 85th Congress began. It is almost impossible to have reported any proposed legislation of this type.

Mr. IVES. I hope the Senator will pause to consider that remark. I have not known of anyone who has come to see me about having some measure reported which he has not been able to have reported, until this matter came up.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Senator not try to get his bill on the no-man's land case reported in 1953?

Mr. IVES. I did not. I was a member of the select committee investigating the whole field.

Let me further explain that the legislation proposed by the Senator from Utah, as is true of the legislation I have proposed, is within the subject matter of discussion of the committee. We discovered in the hearings of the select committee a very good reason why the bill introduced by the Senator, or my bill, or something which is a compromise between the two bills, should be passed. The hearings bore out our contention better than anything else could. I have spoken on this subject to the various State boards and agencies which deal with legislation in this field. I know how they feel and what their experience has been. I am strongly in favor of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not have to wait to have the select committee hold a rackets investigation to find out the need for the proposed legislation.

Mr. IVES. Neither did I. I introduced my bill in 1953.

So long as we have the committee and it deals with the subject, I think it was well to wait to get a report from it. We have that report, which verifies exactly what the Senator and I were aware of.

Mr. WATKINS. The situation was well known before that time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. There is no excuse I can find anywhere for this type of legislation being held back, as it has been held back.

The Senator from New York has referred to the confidence he has in other Senators. Does the Senator from New York have any confidence whatsoever that if this matter takes the course the majority leader has suggested, and which the great Senator from Arkansas wants it to take, we have any prospect of getting legislation on these matters in the present session of Congress?

Mr. IVES. We have more prospect of getting legislation if we do it in that way than we shall have if we jam through the pending bill weighted down with a lot of extraneous amendments.

Mr. WATKINS. I point out that the American people are concerned with the matters to which I have been inviting attention, and they do not want this matter to be dragged on and on. The people want action, and they want it now, if it is humanly possible to get it.

Mr. IVES. Do the people want mere gestures, or real action and real results? Is that what they are after?

Mr. WATKINS. They will get real results.

Mr. IVES. They will not get real results if the matter is handled in the way suggested.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator and I have a difference of opinion.

Mr. IVES. What I have stated is something I know from legislative experience, and the Senator knows it also, if he will only recall what has happened.

Mr. JAVITS, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. COTTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. IVES. I yield first to my colleague from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I appreciate my colleague's yielding to me.

There is one point I have not heard raised regarding the question whether we should press forward for the adoption of the amendments. I should like to invite the attention of the Senators present to that point.

I might say that whether any other Senator has confidence in him or not—and I think all Senators have—I can attest, from my own personal experience, to the fact that 17 million New Yorkers have enormous faith and confidence not only in the integrity of but in the specialized knowledge of IRVING IVES on this subject.

Let me make another remark, which I think is very important. There is one stage of the proceedings which has been covered by the McClellan committee revelations. They are revelations. Now, instead of having the other stage completed by the same kind of deliberate hearings, it is suggested, according to the proposals made, to amend the bill on the floor. We are becoming involved in the very thing which tore the country apart in the drafting of the Taft-Hartley Act, because of the fear that under cover of revelations which showed the existence of a great deal of corruption and racketeering in a minority of labor unions, repressive labor legislation would be passed.

We are inviting exactly that charge now. In going through the second phase, the phase which we Americans honor as the fish-bowl way of proposing legislation, we should act with the same deliberation and thoroughness that we acted in uncovering the wrongs. We should be as thorough in showing what is needed to right the wrongs as we have been in revealing them.

I believe that my colleague is doing his utmost to lead the Senate in the right direction, which is extremely important. The Taft-Hartley law tore the country apart, because the country said that the revelations had been used as an excuse for enacting repressive legislation. We should not do that now. We do not have to do it now.

Mr. IVES. I thank my colleague. I think it is very important that we avoid getting into such a situation that repressive labor legislation might be enacted. I know my good friend from California has no more thought of enacting repressive labor legislation than I have. He never has had any such purpose, and I do not think he will ever have. He and I have discussed these questions many times in years past.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There has not been a single amendment which I have called up in the Senate which can be considered in the slightest degree as repressive to labor. Each of the amendments has been for the protection of labor, and has been brought about because of the revelations before the McClellan committee, and the fact that of our own personal knowledge, in our respective States, and

in our capacity as United States Senators, we have known of the abuses which have been practiced by some. I said yesterday that such abuses were practiced by a minority of the labor leadership.

In no sense can these amendments be considered repressive. The only point I wish to make is one which I made yesterday, and make again today. I think it is important to protect the health and welfare funds, but I think it is equally important that the union member who pays dues, initiation fees, and assessments, shall not have those funds embezzled or used for improper purposes, and shall not have them illegally devoted to political purposes, against the interests of the rank and file member and without his consent. I also believe that he should have the right to determine by secret ballot who his officers are to be, and that he should not be abused by being taken over in a trusteeship.

It so happens that practically all the amendments I have offered have been amendments with respect to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and other Senators on both sides of the aisle have said, "Yes; we support them in principle, but we prefer a different method of approach."

I do not quarrel with that view. I believe in the committee system, but I do not believe that any more important legislation will come before the 85th Congress—with all the important legislation we have before us—than legislation to protect the rank and file of the membership of labor unions, and to restore democratic control over the unions to their own members.

Mr. IVES. Let me comment on what my friend from California has said. I agree with him fully in his attitude toward the legislation per se. He and I do not quarrel on that point. I do not believe that we have ever quarreled, particularly, with respect to labor relations legislation. I think he has received about as much labor support as I have, too.

We differ only as to the method of handling the problem. I assume that the Senator from California would like to see enacted the particular bill now pending. He has been for it all the time in its present form. He has voted against amendments which were offered to change it, when they dealt with the bill itself; and I assume that he would like to see it enacted.

This is a question of judgment. In my judgment we have a far better chance of at least having this bill enacted—and I think it will be enacted if we pass it now and get rid of it—than if we were to make a hodgepodge of it by adding many extraneous amendments.

Every time there is a unanimous-consent agreement in the Senate relating to a limitation of debate, there is a provision in such unanimous-consent agreement that nothing extraneous shall be offered by way of amendment. So we officially recognize that there is such a thing as extraneous matter. Even though that term is not to be found in

our rules, nevertheless, we use it in connection with many of the things we do.

I am honest about this issue, as is the Senator from California. If the bill has added to it a great deal of extraneous matter, or any substantial part of it, I do not believe that it will have half the chance of getting through the House that it would have if it were let alone.

I believe that amendments to the Taft-Hartley law should be placed in one bill. I think we can pass an omnibus bill in the Senate if one is reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

If amendments to the Taft-Hartley are placed in one bill, then if any Senator wishes to offer amendments to the bill, he may do so. I have no objection to that. I believe that such a bill would have a great deal better chance of getting through the House, if it passed the Senate, than would the combination which the Senator from California is offering.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we all recognize that, in the courts of our land and elsewhere, "Justice delayed is justice denied."

We have had ample testimony that for years on end amendments have been offered relative to the Taft-Hartley Act. Senator Taft himself believed that it should be amended in some respects. Ten years have passed, and with the exception of some relatively minor changes, none of such amendments has been adopted. Other Senators, including the Senator from New York, have proposed such legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield to my junior colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that what I am about to say may follow immediately after the comment made by the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from New York? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to make it clear that there was no implication in what I said that so far as labor is concerned, any oppressive amendments were being offered. On the contrary, I find myself in great sympathy with and shall undoubtedly support the amendments on internal administration and grievance machinery.

I point out that the climate in which we legislate is very important for the country in determining whether that on which we legislate shall ever become law. The climate in which we act on the amendments and attach them to the bill could be construed, and will be construed, in many quarters of the country, as being an effort to legislate in a repressive way, based upon the findings of the McClellan committee.

I expressed the greatest confidence in the minority leader; and I will prove it in my own person, by having the honor,

next week, to go to his home community and there make a major speech.

I have the greatest confidence in the motives, and, indeed, in the fundamental objectives, of the amendments which have been submitted.

But I join my senior colleague from New York [Mr. IVES] in the deep conviction that this is not in the best interests of the measures with respect to pension and welfare funds which the national interest dictates that we pass now.

I thank my colleague from New York for allowing me to make this statement.

Mr. IVES. My colleague is very welcome.

The bill to which I referred, which was introduced in 1953, was an omnibus bill calculated to correct many of the evils which have been revealed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We are faced with the situation that we are now approximately half through the second session of the 85th Congress. It is important that we give some protection to the membership of labor unions. I believe that all of us have a responsibility in that connection. Such responsibility is not limited to members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Much as we respect them—and we do have respect for them, regardless of the points of view they represent—as United States Senators we all have a responsibility.

I repeat that I do not believe that the 85th Congress could act upon any more important legislation than legislation in the field of affording protection to labor. We should act upon such legislation. For the past several days we have been trying to afford such protection.

Mr. IVES. I agree 100 percent with the Senator. He spoke the absolute truth. However, I do not believe that we can attain that objective as well through the method he advocates as we would through the method I am advocating.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only point I have in mind—and I think there is some merit to it—is that this particular measure, good as it may be, is not perfect. Some of us felt that way. We voted for it. Perhaps it is not as near perfect as any measure that could be drafted. However, I have been a Member of this body for 13 years, and I know that if we were to wait to get the perfect piece of legislation we would probably never legislate; and if we did the Supreme Court might divide five to four on the question, so that even among learned lawyers there would be no agreement. So we shall never reach utopian perfection.

This is only a small segment of the President's recommendations. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Arkansas entertain certain views as to a broader scope.

Mr. IVES. We still have those views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This happens to be the only piece of proposed legislation which the representatives of the American Federation of Labor-CIO have apparently endorsed. If this measure were combined with other proposals, they might take a more kindly interest in seeing that a broader piece of legisla-

tion was passed than would be the case if this proposal were acted upon by itself.

Mr. IVES. I do not believe that they are as eager as all that to see this particular bill enacted. This is a bill to protect the workers themselves from anything which may be wrong in the management of their funds. I do not believe that the leaders of organized labor are that eager to have this kind of legislation.

Let me say to my good leader that it has required 4 years for us to produce this bill. I grant that it is not perfect. No legislation in a controversial field is ever perfect in the first instance. That has been the trouble with the Taft-Hartley Act. As I said yesterday on the floor, we should have amended it very thoroughly in 1948. Instead of that, we kicked it around as a football of politics. That is what happened. After all the time we have spent on this kind of legislation—1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, and now it is almost the fifth year—I say the pending bill is the best we can do under the circumstances. I predict that no better bill in the first instance can possibly be passed in this particular field. Therefore, I say let us stick to it and nothing else, because we have it with this background.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to take only a moment. The distinguished Senator from New York is to be commended for getting the floor and for thrashing out this one point on the question of procedure. Therefore, I should like to remind the distinguished Senator of something that has happened, which sticks in my mind. Throughout this debate Senators have risen and, without objecting to the merit of the amendments offered, have said, "This is not in the interest of orderly procedure. We should wait for committee consideration."

Very early in the 85th Congress the question arose of extending excise taxes, which were about to expire. During the last week before expiration a bill came before us to extend the excise taxes.

I recall that the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] offered an amendment for some slight relief for small business. Many of us favored such relief. I think in this case it was largely the Senator from California, and the leadership on this side of the aisle, as well as some of the leadership on the other side, who said, "No; don't do that. Don't disrupt orderly procedure. Don't encumber this necessary bill by adding the Fulbright amendment for small business. If you will wait, you shall have a chance to vote on a bill granting such relief."

I then made up my mind, from long experience, that I was never going to vote against something I believe in, merely on someone's promise, no matter how sincere, that I would get another chance to vote on it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator at this point. I shall be happy to yield to him again. That bill was passed, was it not?

Mr. COTTON. Without the amendment; yes.

Mr. IVES. It was approved by the President, was it not?

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. IVES. If it had been passed with the amendment, the same thing would have happened. The House would have accepted the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. IVES. The amendment was non-controversial.

Mr. COTTON. On the contrary, it was controversial. The bill was passed, but the amendment was defeated. Nothing was done for small business tax relief in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. The 2d session is now midway, and so far the opportunity has not arisen again for those of us on the floor to vote for tax relief for small business. I am glad I voted for it when I had the chance.

It is not a question of the sincerity or good faith of Senators. I do not question the sincerity or the good faith of the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. No one in this body has greater confidence in him than have I, or in the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. This is not a matter of good faith. As a matter of good commonsense, I say to the Senator that we should have an opportunity on a ye-and-nay vote to express ourselves on these amendments. They are not new amendments. They have been the subject of consideration for months and even years. It is significant that nearly everyone protests he believes in these amendments but objects merely to the procedure. I know there are good intentions. This Chamber, like some other places, is paved with good intentions. However, I have been here too long and I am too old a dog to rely on someone's promise that next week or the week after next we shall be allowed to vote on these vital matters and to let myself be persuaded to vote against them now.

Mr. IVES. May I make one point there?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. IVES. The Senator may wish to answer me before I have finished. Does the Senator wish only to express himself? Is that all he wants to do? Would he rather do that than to have some legislation enacted?

Mr. COTTON. I want to get both, but I fear I may not get either. What crimes have been committed in the name of "orderly procedure." In my book, whatever is good for the country is good procedure in the Senate.

Mr. IVES. The Senator will sacrifice legislation if he is successful in expressing himself as he desires at this time. The Senator has his choice. If he does not express himself, he will at least get the pending bill passed. Very likely he will get the whole thing. Certainly he will be able to express himself on the other measures, because proposed legislation will be reported.

Mr. COTTON. I have every confidence in the Senator from New York. I wish he would explain why my expressing myself will foreclose me from getting legislation?

Mr. IVES. I did not say the Senator would be foreclosed from expressing himself.

Mr. COTTON. No; from getting legislation.

Mr. IVES. Because, as I have indicated again and again on the floor, if we load the bill down with even small amendments, some will be controversial and all of them will make it necessary for the House to hold hearings, I am sure.

Mr. COTTON. Conversely, if we do not attach any amendments, the pending bill, which is scarcely more than a gesture, will go through Congress. Then we will be faced with the military pay-raise bill and many other questions to prevent further, stronger legislation being presented to us.

Mr. IVES. I do not agree with the Senator's conclusion.

Mr. COTTON. I do not want to be cynical, but I wish to say to my dear friend from New York that he cannot convince me it is not a case of now or never so far as the 85th Congress is concerned.

Mr. IVES. The Senator will never see any bill passed by this Congress if these amendments are voted into it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The time to make the point I wished to make has long since passed. However, I did wish to refer to the statement made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] about his bill, of which I am a cosponsor. That bill involves the so-called no-man's land, and involves, briefly, States rights.

I wish to remind the Senator that back in 1953, which was the last time when any attempts were made to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, the Republicans controlled that committee, and it reported S. 2650. It was reported on a party vote, seven to six. In other words, the Democrats gave us absolutely no support in offering amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, regardless of the fact that for years and years they had been promising in their platform that they would do so. What I wish to recall to the Senator's memory is what killed those amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. The Senator will remember that I submitted an amendment.

Mr. IVES. I remember what killed it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I submitted a so-called States' rights amendment. The Senator and I can argue whether mine was consonant or not with his. I know we disagreed.

Mr. IVES. I had nothing to do with killing it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Nevertheless, an amendment to that point was offered. I thought for a while that we would enact some amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. Here was the issue of States' rights. Yet a motion was made to recommit the bill, and every Democrat, to my memory, voted to send the bill back to committee. It was purely a party line deal. All of my good Southern friends, who profess to be such profound adherents of States' rights, voted against the only opportunity they had

in 10 years, so far as I was aware, to protect their States in the field of labor. I wanted to recall that point to the Senator's memory.

Mr. IVES. I remember it very well.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We have never had an opportunity since then to vote in that field or to vote on any amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, or on anything relating to labor.

I am not being critical of my friend from New York. He has always been with us in our attempts to help labor and in our attempts to amend the Taft-Hartley Act. I am a relatively junior Member of the Senate, and I have to rely on what I have witnessed since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have to rely on the views of Members who have been here 12 years or 15 years or 20 years. I must always remember that what is past is prologue. I can only say, with all due respect to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]—and I have the utmost confidence in his sincerity and honesty, as I have of every member of the committee—that if I have to depend on what has been going on since I have been a Member of the Senate, I believe this is the last opportunity in this Congress we will have to act on this kind of legislation.

Mr. IVES. I should like to comment on that statement. In the first place, I point out that the "no man's land" provision in the bill is a combination of the proposal of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and my own proposal. I think the first part of it is his, and the last part of it is mine. We put them together, so as to have a more complete approach.

Now I will state why, in my judgment, it has not been possible to report individual bills amending particular provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. I think Senators understand the reason and realize why. Every time such a bill is reported, it is loaded with amendments, some of which are very controversial. The Senator has seen some of the amendments. The Senator's amendment was recommitted, because it was here in the open at the time. But the fact is that I had an amendment resting in the eaves.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; and the Senator from New York has offered his amendment.

Mr. IVES. I have not offered it, and I do not intend to offer it. The only thing which would cause me to offer it would be if someone offered an amendment providing for a Federal right-to-work provision.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is that the only reason?

Mr. IVES. That is the only reason.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have been interested in the charges or suggestions that the Subcommittee on Labor has been dilatory. The fact is that the Subcommittee on Labor held extensive hearings on proposed minimum wage legislation, which was reported eventually by the subcommittee last year to the full committee. The committee has been unable, after six or seven meetings, to get a single

rollcall vote on any amendment to the bill, in order to report the bill to the Senate.

I regret that those who are now charging the committee with failure to act on the question of the regulation of unions did not show the same desire to report a bill which would be of benefit to the working men and women who are not protected, in most cases, by collective bargaining agreements. Hundreds of thousands of men and women who are not so protected do not receive a dollar an hour as the minimum wage.

It is unfair to suggest that the committee has been inactive and has ignored the needs of the laboring people, which is the charge that has been made in the Senate for the past 3 days, when at the same time, the committee has been prevented from reporting to the Senate a minimum wage bill, which is desperately needed. I should think that any Senator would be embarrassed to have the session end this year without having provided for an extension of coverage by the minimum wage law.

Many men and women are obliged to work in laundries and retail stores for less than a dollar an hour. Some of them get only 75 or 80 cents an hour, when the cost of living these days is as high as it is. It seems to me that Senators who are genuinely interested in the welfare of the laboring people of the Nation would be interested in having such a bill reported.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think the record should be kept straight. I think there have been about eight meetings held in an attempt to report the bill. There are honest differences of opinion about the merits of the bill to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred. I might tell the Senate that there has never been a hearing on the bill which the Senator is proposing to have reported by the full committee. There are objections to the bill, not only from the Republican side, but, I might remind the Senator, from the Democratic side as well.

I think that inasmuch as the Democrats are making so much to-do about orderly processes, they should not deny any Senator the right to orderly processes in the committee.

I recall to the mind of the Senator, who has a great interest in the subject, that Senators on his side of the aisle—and there may have been some Senators on my side of the aisle as well—bottled up the civil-rights bill for months in the Committee on the Judiciary, until eventually it became necessary to act as we did on the subject.

But the Senator is completely wrong in suggesting that any Republican Senator has been purposeful in trying to block the reporting of the bill to extend the minimum-wage coverage. We have a perfect right to object to a bill which has never had hearings.

Mr. KENNEDY. I may say to the Senator from Arizona that hearings were held on the extension of the coverage of the minimum-wage law by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and then by myself. It was proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the coverage in the bill be extended to

10 million people. We could not get support for that proposal. The number was then reduced to 6 million. We could not get support for that proposal, because one member of the Democratic majority was opposed to it. Therefore, it was necessary to pick up at least one vote from the other side, so as to have a majority. We then reduced the number to 5 million, and then to 4 million. At least seven meetings were held by the committee. It was not possible to have a rollcall vote at any meeting. So the filibustering on the minimum-wage bill has killed the bill in the committee.

If any member of the committee charges the committee with being dilatory in its responsibility to report a minimum-wage bill to the Senate, he should examine his own conscience in this regard. The fact of the matter is that it is absolutely important that every working person in the country should receive at least a dollar an hour. This is far more important, in my opinion, than the amendments which have been so far called up by the Senator from California to the pending bill, even though I share the view that some of them should be enacted; and I have introduced proposed legislation to do so.

But I would put at the head of the list an extension of the Minimum Wage Act for the benefit of the 5 million, 6 million, or 7 million people who are today unprotected by the Minimum Wage Act, and who are, in many cases, working for 70 or 75 cents an hour, and more than 40 hours a week, which is a national disgrace.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Massachusetts has not said how a bill could be discussed or reported without hearings. He knows there have not been hearings.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Arizona has said that so often that he believes it. The fact is that the committee had hearings on all proposed legislation introduced, which included the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. That bill provided for an expansion of the coverage of the minimum wage law to 10 million people. In an attempt to get some support from the side of the Senate of which the Senator from Arizona is a member, the number covered in the bill was reduced from 10 million to 6 million or 7 million, and then from 6 million to 4 million. We still cannot receive the support of one Member on the other side of the aisle in order to report the bill to the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I know something about this matter myself. I distinctly remember, so far as the hearings are concerned, that representatives of some of the people of New York, the retailers of New York State, appeared before our committee. Whether that was a solitary instance or not, I cannot say; but I assumed they must have been heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. The subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee. We are asking the full committee to act on the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The bill on the minimum-wage law, which is before the full committee, as it is written has never had a hearing; and the Senator from

Massachusetts knows it. I do not doubt that hearings have been held on the other bills; I admit that hearings have been held on the other bills. But the bill which the Senator proposes is being put together day by day at the meetings of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I wish to correct an impression which the Senator has tried to leave by his statement. In the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I moved that the minimum wage be increased to \$1. I voted for it on the floor.

I have championed the minimum-wage law in my State ever since I have been in business. So I ask the Senator not to try to leave the impression in the Senate that the junior Senator from Arizona is against the minimum-wage law. I have appeared before the legislature of my State twice in the past 2 years and urged that the State itself raise the minimum wage.

Mr. KENNEDY. The bill to raise the minimum wage to a dollar was introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I am glad the Senator from Arizona supported it.

Will the Senator from Arizona support the proposal to extend the coverage of the minimum-wage law to 4 million more people, in either my bill, the bill of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], or any other bill before our committee?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will support proposed legislation which I feel is proper and right after there have been proper hearings on it. The Senator from Massachusetts has not had hearings on the legislation he has proposed.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Arizona knows quite well that we have had hearings. We reported a bill from the subcommittee to the full committee. The Senator from Arizona knows quite well that we have not had any rollcall votes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is wrong. I have been at every meeting.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Colorado and other Senators have discussed the bills in so much detail that for seven meetings we have not been able to have a rollcall vote on one amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that I have the floor. I suggest to them that we get back on the track.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is correct. He has the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, let me ask whether other Senators desire to speak now on the same subject.

If not, I yield the floor back to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I very firmly believe in the words—

Be ye kind one to another

And—

Bear ye one another's burdens.

I am aware that those who have been blocking and blocking any corrective legislation are struggling with a burden of conscience that must be very heavy. I sympathize with them. I hope that, somehow, by these public confessions,

explanations, and so forth, they will obtain some relief. But, unfortunately, all that does not bring any relief to the country.

The members of the majority party have been led by their leadership into a position that they are going to permit one, little, narrow bill to come before the Senate, and perhaps be enacted into law, but that that is all that will be done on that subject in the 85th Congress.

Now, very fortunately—since this matter has been debated for the last few days—that leadership has retreated and retreated, and retreated again, and has made all sorts of promises of what it will do, now, on what it has been failing to do in the past.

It might be well for us to consider just why the McClellan committee was created and why it was necessary that close to \$1 million be spent to air abuses which have existed in the field of labor and management, when those abuses were known, and have been known throughout the years. The creation of the McClellan committee and its work are evidence of the failure of the appropriate legislative committee to act, not just this year, but in the last 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 years.

Something has been said about how long we have waited on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to hold hearings. My own bill on secondary boycotts, which I have been discussing, yesterday and today, was introduced in the 84th Congress. I respectfully sought a hearing on it, but I received none. On January 7, 1958, in this Congress, I reintroduced the bill. Again I asked for a hearing on it, but again I received none.

But, Mr. President, as you know, the life expectancy of a Senator is limited; the life of a Senator in this world does not run on and on.

It has been stated here that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WALKER] has introduced a bill to clarify a matter in the field of labor-management relations which arises out of the Court's decision in the Wisconsin case, many years ago.

The distinguished Senator from Florida has likewise introduced a bill. That, too, was years and years ago.

As a matter of fact, if we turn back the pages of history, we find that the great, beloved, late Senator Butler of Nebraska for many years was coauthor of this proposal to correct and clarify a matter of law in the field of labor-management relations. The good Senator has gone to his reward; and at least two other Senators have, since then, served in that seat.

Mr. President, how long must we wait on the majority leadership and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, if we are ever to have any legislation in this field?

Again, I remind my colleagues that the life expectancy on this earth of a Senator is limited; and, again, I remind my colleagues that there is concrete evidence that some Senators seek to get such legislation out of this committee before their lives end.

Mr. President, I believe in committee operations; I believe in the principles of committees. But I do not believe that

any committee should have absolute power.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to his colleague?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. First of all, Mr. President, I should like to commend the junior Senator from Nebraska for his lucid and well-organized presentation on the subject he has undertaken to discuss. It shows a great deal of study and much understanding of the subject and, certainly, great familiarity with its history and implications.

I should like to associate myself with, and subscribe to, the views he has expressed and the legislative goals he seeks.

The path he has taken is not the easiest or the most pleasant. It takes a great deal of courage and fearlessness to have pursued it in the way he has done. That is not only my opinion; it is also the opinion, I am sure, of many other Members of the Senate, and also is the opinion of people generally, throughout the country. It is likewise the subject of an editorial by Raymond Moley, which appears in the April 28 issue of Newsweek magazine. It comments also on the role of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRRESPONSIBLE POWER (By Raymond Moley)

Don't believe the stories that Walter Reuther came through his examination before the McClellan committee in March with flying colors. In the persistent questioning by Senators CURTIS, GOLDWATER, and MUNDT, laboring under incredible handicaps, it was made clear that either Reuther refuses to accept responsibility for the conduct of the Kohler strike or, as he claims, he has only slight control over his own union. He revealed a pattern of irresponsible unionism—power without responsibility.

This pattern stood out after I had read carefully and analyzed every word of the 775 pages of the transcript for those 3 days—a task, I am sure, that few have undertaken who now conclude that Reuther won the tilt. My space this week permits only a general delineation of Reuther's denial of responsibility. I shall record later much more of what was revealed, especially the most important point of all, the unrestrained use of UAW power in politics.

THE SENATORS' HANDICAPS

The handicaps encountered by the 3 Senators were, in part: The availability to the 3 Senators of only 3 investigators out of the 50 to 70 employed by the committee; the apparent indifference of the investigators, other than the 3, to Reuther's significance in the general problem for which the committee was created—an indifference made most clear by the conduct of the chief counsel, Robert Kennedy; the insistence of the chief counsel on diverting the course of the inquiry into Reuther's undisputed purity in his private finances; the resistance in the committee to the Reuther inquiry and later

to an attempt to have Reuther testify after, rather than before, the facts had been written into the record; the contemptuous attitude of Reuther and his counsel, Joseph L. Raugh, Jr., toward these United States Senators; the annoyance during the hearings caused by members of Reuther's staff who were flitting about passing notes and comments.

Despite all this, there was elicited from the witness an amazing denial of his responsibility for the conduct of his union and of its high officers.

UAW RESPONSIBILITY

But the union local at Kohler was the creature of the International UAW of which Reuther is the head. The International organized the local, receives dues from it, creates the rules under which it operates. In the Kohler strike it spent more than on any strike it ever had—\$10 million. It paid relief for the strikers; it paid lawyers for defending members and officers charged with crimes; it paid their wages if they were in jail. But violence and illegal mass picketing, completely proved, were placed by Reuther at the door of the local. He visited Kohler only once, and then only to make a speech.

Men responsible to Reuther, such as Earl Mazey, secretary-treasurer and second man in the International, were guilty of arrogant incitements to class feeling at the scene. This was excused by the witness because Mazey has "a low boiling point." He failed to explain why International representatives knew or were alleged to know little of the law in a State in which they had loosed wholesale disorder. Not Reuther but the authorities in Wisconsin had to teach them the laws governing labor disputes. Respected citizens of the State, including members of the clergy and judges, were traduced by union officers, and the courts were violently attacked.

For this revelation of irresponsible power, the country is indebted to Senators CURTIS, GOLDWATER, and MUNDT. They also served the public interest by bringing before the country the picture of lawlessness at Kohler. They put this Union and others on notice that in the long run they will be judged by what they do and not by what they say in their propaganda.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Nebraska about the question of time to which he has just referred. Is it not true that not only is the life expectancy of a Senator limited, but likewise the business lives of individual owners of businesses are considerably limited; particularly when they are put under pressures as the ones my colleague described, and that that limitation of time is, and has been, fatal to many, many businesses, and threatens to be fatal to many similar businesses, unless corrective action is taken soon?

Mr. CURTIS. My distinguished colleague is so correct, Mr. President. Because of the secondary boycott, many little businesses today are no more. In the State of Nebraska, countless businesses have, as a result of the secondary boycott, had to go out of existence. These businesses have gone under while the labor czars in the country have been able to hold the line and to prevent the Congress from enacting any legislation which would deal effectively with these problems.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank my colleague very much for that observation.

Again, I should like to say that the measure my colleague has introduced and the information given us by means

of the presentation made here by him represent a great contribution; and I am sure it will be very, very helpful as the Senate continues, from now on, to consider this proposed legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank my colleague. Mr. President, as I have stated, I believe in committee procedure. But I do not believe in extending to any committee absolute power—power without limitation or restriction—nor do I believe in extending to any committee the power to prevent the parent body from acting when the committee refuses to act.

When a committee of the Senate elects for 3, 4, or 5 years, not to hold hearings on a much-needed piece of legislation, what right have members of the committee to come to the floor of the Senate and say, "Do not touch that subject matter, because we have not held hearings"?

Mr. President, I ask the question, Are committees the agents of the Senate, or is the Senate the agent of committees? Are committees the creatures of the Senate, or is the Senate the creature of committees? Is the Senate the master of its committees, or are committees the master of the Senate?

The refusal of the committee to bring before the Senate proposed legislation, not this week, not this month, not this year, but throughout the years, has disqualified its members from protesting action on proposed legislation without first having committee action.

Mr. President, last night, when I yielded the floor to the majority leader, I had been discussing the evils of the secondary boycott. Secondary boycotts are activities which are engaged in not at the site of a labor dispute between management and labor but at other places, and the victims of such activities are neutral third persons.

Prior to the Taft-Hartley Act, secondary boycotts were held to be unlawful by many courts. The Congress thought it had outlawed secondary boycotts in the Taft-Hartley law. But because of resistance to the law, because of conniving to find loopholes in the law, loopholes have been developed.

The Taft-Hartley Act made it unlawful to coerce or prevent employees of companies which were not themselves affected by a labor dispute from working in connection with the production of goods or in performing services. So the labor leaders moved in and applied pressure on the employer. They said to the employer, "If you do business with another firm with which we have a dispute, we will picket your business, or we will prevent supplies from reaching your company, or we may even cause a strike in your plant."

That is pressure on a neutral employer who is not involved in a labor dispute. Many employers were driven out of business because of such practices.

Another loophole discovered by the connivers was the hot-cargo provision, whereby a strong union would write into its contract a provision that the employer would agree not to do business with someone the union labeled as being unfair. A loophole arose because of the words "in the course of employment,"

which limited the field so that a secondary boycott could be carried on, contrary to, and in violation of, the intent of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On yesterday I discussed the loophole arising out of the word "concerted"; the loophole arising out of the definition of the word "employee"; also secondary picketing and organizational and recognition picketing.

Last night, when I yielded the floor, I had started to tell about the experiences of the Coffey Transfer Co. in the State of Nebraska. The Coffey Transfer Co. was a trucking company that had been in existence for 20 years. It had 22 drivers. It operated in the small, but delightful, town of Alma, Nebr., a county seat with a population of 2,000.

The Teamsters Union came into the town and boycotted the company, and refused to turn over freight which was designated by shippers to go on the Coffey Transfer Co. trucks. The Union started this attack against Coffey Transfer Co. in August 1955. I read step by step the actions which were taken.

January arrived, and the dispute still was not settled. On January 11, 1956, a strike was called, in Omaha and Minneapolis, against Des Moines Transportation Co., and was settled as soon as that company agreed not to turn freight over to the Coffey Transfer Co.

On January 13 a strike was called against the Darling Transfer Co. of Kansas City, Mo. No reason was given for the strike. The strike was settled just as soon as the Darling Transportation Co. agreed not to turn freight over to the Coffey Transfer Co.

On January 18 an announcement was made that the election which was to be participated in by the 22 drivers of the Coffey Transfer Co. was rescheduled for January 24.

On January 24, 1956, the election was held.

On February 3, 1956, the NLRB filed an injunction suit, which was set for a hearing by the Federal court in Omaha for February 13.

On February 13, the injunction suit was started before Judge Donahue. Judge Donahue died before the suit was completed.

Then the injunction suit was heard from March 15 to March 19, by Judge Delehant.

On March 23, the workers and the small-business men received word from their great Government in Washington that the ballots of the 22 drivers would be counted on March 28.

On March 28, 1956, the election results were made public. The Teamsters Union did not get the vote of one driver. Its score was zero. There were four votes against the Union, and none for the Union.

But there is another part to that story. By means of the boycott the Union drove that small company out of business. The maneuvering and conniving and seeking of delay were going on for many months. One month before the ballots were made public, the Coffey Transfer Co. went out of business.

I visited the city of Alma some months afterward, and I asked the good citizens of that community what happened

to the 22 drivers for Coffey Transfer, which had been driven out of business. They told me that 21 of them and their families had moved away, and that the last one was leaving the next week.

That is an example of a secondary boycott and what it can do. There was no labor dispute at the Coffey Transfer Co. The Teamsters Union boycotted the company because the management would not force the workers into a union which they did not want to join.

No one should labor under the impression that this is a problem of truckers only, even though transportation is vital to our entire economy. Secondary boycotts could put druggists, grocers, blacksmiths, farmers, and all other people out of business. They can endanger free speech and put newspapers and radio stations out of business. A letter to me from Cleveland, Ohio, says: "The announcer's union subjected many of the Cleveland station's customers to extreme pressure, either through other unions or through telephone and personal contact. This pressure resulted in the eliminating of practically all business from this station in about 3 weeks' time."

Mr. President, what is going to happen to the free press in America if all the advertisers of a newspaper can be told, "If you do not boycott this newspaper there will be trouble at your place of business. A picket line will be established and your customers will not be able to come into your place of business without being intimidated and frightened and sometimes insulted and treated with disrespect."

This is one of the abuses which a great many people throughout the country, for 3, 4, or 5 years, have been begging the legislative committee to consider. Now, the committee takes the position, "The Senate must not consider that question because no hearings have been held." The committee has continued to elect not to hold hearings.

Do Senators believe in the absolute power of committees? I do not believe in absolute power for any branch or department of our Government, let alone any subagency thereof.

One of the Nebraska transfer companies that has been victimized has this to say:

I would feel different about this affair, if it were one between our company and our employees; but our employees do not want to join the Union, but this being a free country, it would appear that their wishes should be abided with.

Mr. President, I do not wish to convey the impression that this is a matter which pertains to only one State. Secondary boycotts have been carried on in almost every State of the Union—yes, I would say in every State of the Union.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Oklahoma City Times of Monday, July 22, 1957. I read from the clipping:

President of a small Oklahoma City freight company Monday charged the Teamsters Union with resorting to gangster tactics in an attempt to organize my office staff.

Charles W. Ryan, of the Ryan freight lines, 1016 Southwest Second, said tires were slashed Sunday night on three of his larger units, after "labor goons warned me there would be trouble."

At the same time, Ryan said his drivers, all Teamsters Union men, have been crossing the picket lines of the local Machinists Union No. 850, currently trying to organize Ryan's office personnel.

Ryan charged the organization move was handed over by Teamster officials to the Machinists Union after I got an injunction against the Teamsters for high pressuring my office help.

Exactly what sort of persuasion and pressure do they use? I find a significant paragraph in the same article.

"For several weeks these guys (teamsters) came around, one with a snake, the other with a shotgun in his car, and started following our trucks out and harassing the drivers," Ryan charged.

In reference to that same situation, I read from the Daily Oklahoman of July 21, 1957:

TEAMSTER ORGANIZER BOASTS "WE'LL MAKE STATE CRAWL"

(By Jack Jones)

"We're going to bring a truckload of rattlesnakes into this town and turn them loose. These yokels here haven't seen anything yet. But they will, you can bet every day of our life they will.

"When we get through with this cowpatch everybody in the country will know what kind of stuff they're made of here in Oklahoma. They'll be crawling on their sleazy bellies clear to Washington begging for help. But it won't do them any good, no sir, not when we get through with them."

How did those gangsters know that the appeals of decent people would do no good in Washington? What pipeline did they have with those whose responsibility it is to keep a watchful eye on the legislation coming under their jurisdiction and recommend amendments thereto?

The article continues:

"But it won't do any good, no, sir; not when we get through with them."

The man who made that little speech represents himself to be a labor organizer from Los Angeles. He works for the Teamsters Union which refers to its special terror squads as "rattlesnakes."

He made the statement here last April 7 in a downtown Oklahoma City hotel room in what he thought was a secret discussion of the things his employers—the racket-ridden west coast Teamster local—have in mind for Oklahoma.

The man who made this arrogant boast is S. F. "Salty" Dykes, a square-jawed, gruff talking veteran of many a jolting Teamster campaign across the country. He came here with another west coast Teamster organizer, Skeeter Barnes.

Yes, Mr. President, these gangsters threatened Oklahoma City that they would turn a truckload of rattlesnakes loose and show the country what that cowpatch amounted to, but the startling thing in the article is this statement:

They'll be crawling on their sleazy bellies clear to Washington begging for help. But it won't do them any good, no sir, not when we get through with them.

What pipeline did they have to individuals who had it within their power to bring up legislation, to enable them to say, "Although all the decent people and the workers and management representatives come to Washington for help, it will not do any good"?

I hold in my hand another statement concerning boycotts. This has to do with a racing boycott. It reads:

By using an unfair secondary boycott a local Miami union boss was able to halt coast-to-coast racing broadcasts and telecasts from Florida's Hialeah racetrack, and involve two famed Miami Beach hotels in a drive to force unwanted unionism on a small group of radio and television engineers.

According to a National Labor Relations Board trial examiner's report, local 349 of the AFL-CIO International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers demanded that a new Miami station WCKT and WCKR, being built for the Biscayne Television Corp., sign a union recognition contract before the station was open for business.

The management discussed contract terms with the IBEW, but suggested the union first get itself certified as the official representative of employees. The union refused to do this, undoubtedly knowing it was an unwanted organization.

The union in October 1956, picketed the famed Fontainebleau Hotel and the Thunderbird Motel on Miami Beach because WCKT was handling remote broadcasts from these locations. Construction work on the new stations also halted when IBEW requested support for its forced unionism drive from the Miami Building Trades Council.

In January 1957, the first of a series of national broadcasts from Hialeah was scheduled over the National Broadcasting Co., and the union began threatening a secondary boycott at the racetrack if WCKT was permitted to carry the races.

Twenty-five electricians at the track suddenly failed to come to work, and painters at Hialeah walked off their jobs. The management feared that Hialeah would not open in time for the 1957 season.

IBEW then sought to have Hialeah break its contract with WCKT, tried to compel NBC in New York to send unionized engineers to Miami to handle the broadcasts, and attempted to make Hialeah use another local station. The track advised WCKT that the IBEW would not permit them to televise featured races January 19 and 23.

Mr. President, for 5 years the victims of secondary boycotts have waited upon the legislative committee which now says, "Grant no relief until we have had an opportunity to hold hearings." What is going on in this Chamber is not fooling anyone in the country. There is the smoothest, most effective machine imaginable at work to block corrective legislation, so that none will be enacted. That was the plan. That is what is being carried out. There has been some indication of retreat from that position on the part of the majority leadership. I hope we can have corrective legislation. We are to have an opportunity to vote for secondary boycotts, and to approve them, or to vote against them, and to carry out the intent of the Taft-Hartley law, to outlaw secondary boycotts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Personally, I am glad that the Senator from Nebraska has had printed the amendment which he proposes to offer later, and that he is discussing the subject of secondary boycotts.

I have been receiving telegrams and communications on the subject. At this time I should like to bring to the atten-

tion of the Senators from Nebraska a telegram from the secretary of a South Dakota implement dealers' association. It reads as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 25, 1958.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please support Curtis amendment S. 2888 and help close secondary boycott loopholes in organizational picketing.

FRANK BEYER,
Secretary, South Dakota Implement
Dealers Association.

The secondary boycott problem is not new. We sought to deal with it in labor legislation in 1946 and 1947, but we were not wholly successful, as the Senator has indicated. The implement dealers are concerned because they have learned by experience that when strikes have involved some of the implement machinery manufacturers at a time when the harvest season or the haying season was in progress, they could not obtain parts, because the strike affected the plant, and the normal trucking facilities were not available to deliver the material. It was incumbent upon the farmer, in many cases, to travel several hundred miles in his own truck in the hope of getting the parts which he needed.

That situation has stirred up a great deal of feeling that Congress should enact effective legislation in the field.

I expect to vote for the amendment which the Senator proposes to offer later in the discussion of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, appeals have come in from every State of the Union for relief from secondary boycotts.

I wish to read from a letter which tells about the case of a small trucker in the great State of Texas. I shall quote one paragraph from it:

I write this letter also to call your attention to what I think is a deplorable situation. If you do not already know about it, this company has had over 100 violences to its equipment and motors. By violences, I mean holes drilled in tires, rifle shots into their equipment, explosive bombs attached to their motors, and various other means whereby the general morale of a trucking company owner could be lowered.

He tells me that he has had very little, if any, help from anyone aside from the Texas Rangers, and, of course, they are limited as to what they can do. He tells me very frankly that he felt that, had it not been for the Texas Rangers, today he would be dead, literally and figuratively.

Here was a small Texas businessman, and the only relief he could get was from the great, historic agency known as the Texas Rangers. That little Texas businessman needs legislative relief. His business is being blocked today. It is blocked in conformity with the pattern laid down by the union bosses that there be no legislation.

Rest assured that had this little, narrow bill which came from the committee been permitted to go through without the offering of amendments, the dream of the bosses that there be no legislation would have come true. But that dream is going to be interrupted at least for a roll call, and eventually we will

get legislation which will help to establish a law and authority that will prevent the confiscation and destruction of the property of little-business men.

A short time ago I told about the boycott that put out of business the Coffey Transfer Co., of Alma, Nebr. It is interesting to note that what was left of that little independent business concern was sold to one of the largest transportation companies in the country. The boycotting of business activities and business entities is one of the most potent forces for monopoly and merger in the country.

I call attention to a jurisdictional dispute which is set forth in a letter I received from Cleveland, Ohio:

For years we have been plagued by such boycotts of our industrial roof ventilators produced in our plant, which has been organized by the MESA, the Mechanics Educational Society of America, a labor union affiliated with the AFL-CIO. These boycotts have been inaugurated by the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, an AFL union now affiliated with the CIO since the merger, whose claim is that any sheet-metal product not made in an AFL shop organized by themselves is a scab product.

The threats of refusal to handle our products are very effective with those contractors who normally secure sheet-metal workers from the Sheet Metal Workers Hiring Hall, and has resulted in a considerable loss of business in a field in which we have been the leaders for over 50 years.

Mr. President, are the Texas Rangers the only friends to which small business can turn when unlawful secondary boycotts are carried out? Can we not have any legislative relief?

The State of Texas is not the only State that needs legislation to prohibit secondary boycotts, to save the property of its citizens and bring about law and order. I wish to read about a boycott that occurred in New York State:

A \$100,000 secondary boycott damage suit has been filed against a radio broadcasters union by a Binghamton, N. Y., radio station.

Following a wage dispute between employees and the management of Radio Station WNEB, the union called a strike and waged a secondary boycott against neutral companies sponsoring the station's programs. WNEB replaced the strikers in order to continue serving the public.

Imagine that, Mr. President. In the great State of New York, businesses—small businesses, medium-sized businesses, and large businesses—are picketed and boycotted. Is it because they have labor trouble? Not at all. It is because they bought radio time on a radio station, and that radio station later had a labor dispute. What is going to happen to free speech and to the free press in this country? Is it to be free speech and free press with the consent of the boycotting unions? These victims of boycotts in New York State may have to appeal to the Texas Rangers, if they cannot get any relief from Congress.

Union pressure was applied as electricians at a local electrical supply company threatened to walk out unless their employer canceled sponsorship of a WNEB program.

Crowley's Milk Co., another Binghamton firm, refused to be intimidated by the secondary boycott threat and continued its broadcasts, but an insurance company was

forced to cancel its sports program as a result of union pressure on its agents.

The insurance company did not have any labor dispute. Yet it was boycotted, and its agents were subjected to pressure unless they stopped broadcasting some sporting events to the boys and girls and men and women of that community.

For 5 long years the people have been begging the legislative committee to hold hearings on secondary boycotts. Today Senators say, "Don't legislate until we have had a chance to hold hearings."

Mr. President, it is not possible to hold hearings unless a committee wants to hold hearings.

I read further:

Telephone lines of other sponsors were suddenly tied up by phonejamming techniques and operators were subjected to obscene language. Other companies suffered losses in business through the union's urging its members to wage a boycott against sponsors.

It is not only an attack upon independent businesses; it is a shutting off of a radio station, a medium of free speech. All of that is taking place in the great State of New York, after the people had begged that the great Government of the United States clarify the law and plug up the loopholes with respect to secondary boycott. This is not an issue concerning the jurisdiction of a committee. No amendment here is out of order. The issue is whether one favors the vicious secondary boycott or is against it. Our action will be interpreted by the people of the country.

I call attention to another case. This one also comes from Ohio. This very interesting letter, addressed to me, reads, in part:

For the past 15 years, my business has suffered immeasurable albeit positive damage in direct consequence of a continuing secondary boycott instigated and enforced by the AFL Carpenters' Unions for the direct benefit of its member-contractors who compete in such business for profit. Prolonged litigation, conducted by myself without benefit of counsel, seeking recovery and injunctive relief under Ohio antitrust statutes was unsuccessful, notwithstanding conclusive proof by the evidence and defendants' admission of such conduct.

The letter then has this paragraph:

As a disabled war veteran who did not serve to make this Nation safe for dictatorship in any sphere of civic activity, I will, if financially able at the time to do so, appear and testify at the committee hearings on behalf of Senate bill 70.

The business of that disabled war veteran is being destroyed while he waits for the committee to hold hearings on secondary boycotts. But let us not delude ourselves. The people of the Nation know that here and now we have a chance to enact corrective legislation. They know that the will of the bosses is being carried out that there be no legislation. It is not a procedural question. Every amendment here is in accord with the established rules and procedures of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have a letter from another victim of secondary boycotts, a

practice which has been described as economic blackmail, a practice which we thought was outlawed when the Taft-Hartley law was passed. But the connivers have forced loopholes into the law; and for all these long years, we have asked the committee to hold hearings concerning the loopholes. This is what the writer of a letter to me from Olean, N. Y., has to say:

Our warehouse has been picketed since July 6. We have had to switch all deliveries from truck to rail with consequent increased costs, delays, and out-of-stock conditions. We are, and have been, perfectly willing to have the NLRB conduct an election. Our employees have formed an independent union and have asked NLRB to certify them as bargaining agent after having conducted an election. The company has agreed, the independent union has agreed, the NLRB has agreed, and the teamsters have refused. The picketing goes on.

Mr. President, the Teamsters Union has refused. Dave Beck and his gang have refused. So has the committee refused to hold any hearings. Others can wait, but I shall offer my amendment.

The letter continues:

Even though the NLRB in Washington has recently ruled that hot-cargo clauses in common carrier contracts are illegal, the teamsters union continues to insist that these carriers are not to handle any freight destined for our warehouse. These carriers are so frightened by the prospects of what this union can do to them, that they jump every time the union says "frog."

Mr. President, if only a small number of the people who have sent letters to Congress asking for relief from secondary boycotts were permitted to be heard by the committee, it would take a long, long time, because those requests have piled up for 2, 3, 4, and 5 years.

I have a letter from Denver. It was addressed to our former colleague, the distinguished Eugene Millikin. The problem existed at that time. Attempts were made to have hearings on the measure then. But those who asked for hearings did not get them. I read from the letter to former Senator Millikin:

We culminated an 8-months-old strike in April of this year, which when we asked for NLRB election to recertify the union, we received a 16 to nothing vote against the union by our employees. However, during the strike the pressures of secondary boycotts were much more costly to us and we feel a much more vicious weapon than violence. We feel that the use of a secondary boycott and its implications are tools which apparently were not designed by our Constitution to be in the war chests of the labor bosses. Coercion directly made to employer is one thing, coercion on a third party is another.

Dave Beck is against outlawing the secondary boycott. I asked him. He said so in our hearings. When the roll is called, I will not line up with him. I will help the people who have been the victims of this vicious practice—the secondary boycott. Congress expressed itself in the Taft-Hartley law as wanting to outlaw secondary boycotts. We are asking that the loopholes be plugged up. This is not a new principle.

I received a letter from the great State of Pennsylvania, written to me by a

businessman in Pittsburgh. I read a portion of it:

It is next to impossible for any trucking firm outside of this area to bring a truck into the city of Pittsburgh for the simple task of unloading freight without paying tribute to Teamsters Local 249. Whenever a truck comes into the city it is required to hire a member of local 249 before it can unload its freight. Ninety-nine percent of the time the man is not needed. He has to be hired. He has to be paid a day's wages, even though the average unloading takes less than 2 hours. If he is not hired, the teamster member makes it clear that the passage of the truck through the area might not be a safe one.

Where is that, Mr. President? Behind the Iron Curtain? No. That is in Pittsburgh. I continue to read:

Many a truck has been tipped over, the driver beat up, the goods scattered. A roving band of teamsters members polices the roads leading into the city, and a member approaches all trucks from outside the area which do not belong to local 249. It is a rare truck, indeed, that manages to get into the city, unload its freight, and get out without paying tribute.

The Barbary pirates had nothing on our local 249.

Mr. President, there are so many letters from citizens of this country who ask for legislative relief to plug up the loopholes in the secondary-boycott field that it is impossible for me to read all of them at this time.

But before the Senate concludes its consideration of this bill, I shall offer my amendment, and I shall seek to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of agreeing to it. Thus, I shall give all Senators an opportunity to take their position on the question of continuing to outlaw secondary boycotts and closing up these loopholes, or on refusing to do so and permitting these abuses to continue.

Mr. President, let there be no misunderstanding about it: The amendment will be in accord with our regular procedures; it will not be brought forward in an irregular fashion. The amendment will afford a clear test as to whether the Senate wishes to outlaw secondary boycotts.

Mr. President, we have waited 5 years for hearings. Now the committee comes rushing through the door, and cries, "Wait until we hold hearings."

Mr. President, the life expectancy of a Senator on this earth is limited. Many of our departed colleagues sought hearings before that committee on measures, in which they believed, to correct abuses in the field of labor and management. How much longer shall we have to wait, Mr. President?

I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I desire to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I believe he has rendered a magnificent service to the Senate by pointing out and highlighting some of the important abuses which have occurred and some of the very logical reasons for the adoption of his amendment.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, as well as to my other colleagues in the Senate, that on this very important matter I have received

received numerous communications—telegrams and letters—from my own State, and also numerous ones from persons who live beyond the borders of my State.

It was on February 9, 1954, in the 83d Congress, 2d session, that I introduced Senate bill 2898, which dealt with the matter of secondary boycotts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. When did the Senator from Kansas say he introduced that bill?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I introduced it on February 9, 1954.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, when this year comes to its close, 5 years will have passed since the Senator introduced his bill; is that correct?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Yes. But no hearings have ever been held on the bill, and no offer was made to hold hearings on it.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I intend to support the amendment offered by him, because I believe it is high time to close the loopholes which now riddle section 8 (b) (4) of the Taft-Hartley Act which deals with secondary boycotts.

Over and over again, countless committees of Congress have documented the injuries done to innocent persons by the vicious technique of the secondary boycott in labor-management relations. These evils rose to intolerable proportions as labor unions grew in power and forged, with other unions, alliances to bring overwhelming pressure to bear on persons not even remotely involved in labor disputes.

Secondary boycotts were illegal even before the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. It is an elementary principle of justice that coercion cannot be used against innocent third persons, not parties to a strike or labor dispute. But our committees found that innocent men were deprived of employment and many small businesses were ruined when, through no fault or act of their own, they were caught between the warring parties to a labor dispute. Until the passage of the Norris-La Guardia Act, such cases had been reached by injunction, and protection was given to innocent persons. But in that act, the restrictions against injunctions took away this protection. It is certainly ironic that, in an attempt to relieve unions from unjust harassment by injunctions, we should place it within their power to do great harm to others, through these secondary boycotts. But that was the result.

From the debates preceding the passage of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, it is clear beyond dispute that Congress intended to stop, once and for all, the resort to this unscrupulous practice. We thought we accomplished our purpose in section 8 (b) (4), which prohibited such tactics as an unfair labor practice.

On this point, let me quote from the conference report to the House of Representatives:

Under clause (A) of 8 (b) (4), strikes or boycotts, or attempts to induce or encourage such action, were made unfair labor practices if the purpose was to force an em-

ployer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of another, or to cease doing business with any other person. Thus, it was made an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in a strike against employer A for the purpose of forcing that employer to cease doing business with employer B. Similarly, it would not be lawful for a union to boycott employer A because employer A uses or otherwise deals in the goods of, or does business with, employer B. (H. Rept. No. 510, 80th Cong., 1st sess., p. 43.)

But, Mr. President, the intent of Congress to stop this vicious practice has been all but completely nullified by subsequent developments under the Taft-Hartley Act. Clever union lawyers searched for, and found, loopholes which made it possible to get around this provision. NLRB rulings and decisions, many of them sustained by the courts, allowed further evasions of the law. So today, the evils of secondary boycotts are flourishing almost as widely as they were before Congress was forced to prohibit them.

One of these loopholes is the threat to a neutral employer who is not involved in a labor dispute that he will be boycotted if he does not cease doing business with the employer who is involved in a strike. Where a small-business man is concerned, the mere threat of trouble can be just as effective as a boycott itself. It can ruin his business.

Another loophole is the refusal to handle goods which the union labels "hot cargo." The NLRB saw no objection to this if collective-bargaining contracts carried a clause permitting unions to take this kind of action. But it is precisely the kind of boycott Congress intended to prohibit.

A third loophole permits unions to refuse to allow their members to work for an employer alleged to be unfair, even though he is not himself involved in a labor dispute. In cases where the employer has to depend heavily upon unions for work assignments of men, this kind of boycott can be cruelly effective.

A fourth loophole makes customer boycotts possible. Thus, an innocent retail store may be picketed if it sells goods of a manufacturer where there is a labor dispute.

In applying the secondary boycott section of the act, the NLRB has so narrowed the definitions of employer, employee, and persons in section 2 of the act, that another loophole has been created in which secondary boycotts can be instituted with impunity.

At this juncture in my remarks, I wish to draw the Senate's attention to an excellent pamphlet entitled, "You May Have Wondered How the Federal Courts and NLRB Have Dealt With Secondary Boycotts." On the next page it states: "Here is the answer." The pamphlet is an outline analysis of the Taft-Hartley prohibitions by a distinguished member of the Massachusetts bar, Charles H. Tower, which was copyrighted in February 1954.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire pamphlet be placed in the Record at this point as a part of

my remarks, as it is an excellent analysis, which is documented in detail, and is one of a series of articles that was most helpful, and which will be most helpful as we consider the entire matter when it comes before the Senate.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YOU MAY HAVE WONDERED HOW THE FEDERAL COURTS AND NLRB HAVE DEALT WITH SECONDARY BOYCOTTS—HERE IS THE ANSWER: SECONDARY BOYCOTTS, AN OUTLINE ANALYSIS OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY PROHIBITION

(By Charles H. Tower, member of Massachusetts Bar)

The Taft-Hartley Act, passed in 1947, contains a prohibition against secondary boycotts.¹ Not all the traditional forms of secondary boycotts are proscribed by the act.² Moreover, the so-called secondary boycott section, 8 (b) (4), covers some primary as well as secondary activity.³ This analysis will deal principally with the effect of the act on the recognized forms of the secondary boycott.⁴

I. STATUS OF SECONDARY BOYCOTTS PRIOR TO 1947

1. Secondary boycotts generally have been regarded by the courts as unlawful: (a) "American judicial decision has come into general agreement that there is a distinction between a primary boycott and a secondary boycott and, as shall be seen hereafter, the primary boycott, if peacefully carried on, is legal, while the secondary boycott is illegal because involving the exercise of coercion upon innocent third persons not parties to the dispute." (Ludwig Teller, *Labor Disputes and Collective Bargaining*, p. 454, 1940.)

2. But the Norris-La Guardia Act, passed in 1932, placed severe limitations on the power of Federal courts to issue injunctions in labor dispute cases, including those involving secondary boycotts: " (a) 'The short answer to the argument that the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 * * * has removed the limitations of the Norris-La Guardia Act upon the power to issue injunctions [by the Federal courts] against what are known as secondary boycotts, is that the law has been changed only where injunction is sought by the National Labor Relations Board, not where proceedings are instituted by a private party.' (From opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in *Bakery Sales Drivers Union v. Wagshal* (333 U. S. 437, 442).)

II. THE INTENT OF CONGRESS IN 1947

1. It is apparent that the Congress in 1947 intended to make secondary boycotts unlawful by the Federal statute:⁵ (a) "The Sena-

tor will find a great many decisions * * * which hold that under the common law a secondary boycott is unlawful. Subsequently, under the provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act, it became impossible to stop a secondary boycott or any other kind of a strike, no matter how unlawful it may have been at common law. All this provision of the bill (sec. 8 (b) (4)) does is to reverse the effect of the law as to secondary boycotts. It has been set forth that there are good secondary boycotts and bad secondary boycotts. Our committee heard evidence for weeks and never succeeded in having anyone tell us any difference between different kinds of secondary boycotts. So we have so broadened the provision dealing with secondary boycotts as to make them an unfair labor practice." (Statement by the late Senator Robert Taft, who sponsored the bill in the United States Senate, made on the floor of the Senate in June 1947, shortly before the passage of the act.)

III. THE TAFT-HARTLEY BAN ON SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

1. The Taft-Hartley Act contains three separate sections dealing with secondary boycotts.

(a) Section 8 (b) (4) defines the prohibited activity without using the term "secondary boycott."

In essence, the section makes it unlawful for a union or its agents to urge the employees of an employer to refuse to perform work for the purpose of compelling their employer to cease doing business with some other person.⁶

(b) Section 10 (1) sets up the so-called mandatory injunction procedure requiring representatives of the NLRB's General Counsel to apply for injunctive relief when preliminary investigation of a charge indicates that a secondary boycott exists.⁷

(c) Section 303 permits the prosecution in the Federal courts of civil suits to collect damages for injuries resulting from secondary boycotts.⁸

IV. THE LANGUAGE OF SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

1. During the past few years, the NLRB, the courts and labor relations experts have developed a secondary boycott terminology. Some of the more important terms are briefly defined below:

(a) Secondary boycott: A union tactic whereby a dispute with Employer A is used as a justification for putting economic pressure on Employer B.

(b) Primary employer: The primary employer is the one with whom the union has a basic dispute. It is Employer A in the example above. It should be kept in mind that the union may have made no direct demands upon the primary employer. The dispute may be based on the fact that, for a variety of reasons, the union regards the primary employer as unfair.

¹ 93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4323.

² In *International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 501, et al. v. NLRB* (181 F. 2d 34) Judge Learned Hand said: "The gravamen of a secondary boycott is that its sanctions bear, not on the employer who alone is a party to the dispute, but upon some third party who has no concern in it. Its aim is to compel a man to stop business with the employer in the hope that this will induce the employer to give in to his employee's demands."

³ From the effective date of the act in August 1947 until December 31, 1953, 162 petitions for injunctions in boycott cases were filed with the following results: 65 temporary injunctions issued, 21 denied, 2 pending, and 74 withdrawn, generally because the unions ceased their boycott activities in the face of the injunction threat.

⁴ There have been only 15 decisions involving this section of the act.

(c) Secondary employer: The secondary employer is the neutral employer with whom the union has no basic dispute. It is Employer B in the definition above. Normally, the objective is to get Employer B (the secondary employer) to cease doing business with Employer A (the primary employer).

(d) Primary situs: The primary situs is the premises of the primary employer.

(e) Roving situs: Roving situs is a term used to refer to the activities of an employer conducted away from his main place of business. Trucks of a trucking company, for example, have been regarded in some Board and court decisions as constituting moving or roving situses.

(f) Hot cargo clause: A hot cargo clause is a provision in a collective bargaining contract which specifically allows union members to refuse to handle goods or equipment when supplied by another employer whom the union regards as unfair.

V. EFFECT OF THE SECONDARY BOYCOTT PROHIBITION

1. Despite the intent of Congress generally to outlaw secondary boycotts and threats thereof, the objective has not been achieved completely—partly because of NLRB and court interpretations and partly because of apparently inadvertent omissions in the original statutory language: (a) Among the more important loopholes are the following:

(1) Picketing the trucks of a primary employer wherever they may go;

(2) Permitting otherwise unlawful secondary activity because it is covered by a clause in a collective bargaining contract;

(3) Placement of a primary employer on an unfair list regardless of the purpose and distribution of the list;

(4) Inducement of employees of a secondary employer to refuse to enter the premises of a primary employer;

(5) Secondary consumer or customer boycotts;

(6) Threats of secondary boycotts addressed to supervisors;

(7) Inducement of concerted refusals to accept employment with a secondary employer;

(8) Secondary activity permitted because of restricted interpretations of terms "employee" and "person."

VI. ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY BOYCOTT PROVISIONS IN THE LIGHT OF NLRB AND COURT INTERPRETATIONS

1. Only "a labor organization or its agents" can be guilty of violating the secondary boycott section of the act.

(a) Individual employees, except where acting as agents for a union, are not subject to the statutory prohibition.⁹

(b) A union will be liable for the acts of its agents where the agents are acting within the general scope of their authority or where the union has ratified their conduct.¹⁰

2. "To induce or encourage" employees of a secondary employer to refuse to perform work is the unlawful activity.

(a) Traditional forms of inducement are speeches, leaflets, letters, conversations, and picket lines.¹¹ The Supreme Court has

⁹ Several bills discussed in 1947 extended the boycott prohibition to individuals. See, for example, S. 55 introduced by Senator Ball on January 6, 1947.

¹⁰ The most comprehensive treatment of the agency problem as applied to unions can be found in *Sunset Line and Twine Co.* (73 NLRB 1487). For boycott cases dealing with the same problem see *Sealright Pacific Ltd.*, (82 NLRB 271); *The Pure Oil Company* (84 NLRB 315); *Hammermill Paper Co.* (100 NLRB 1176); *Santa Ana Lumber Co.* (87 NLRB No. 135).

¹¹ *International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 501, AFL, et al. v. NLRB* (341 U. S. 694, 701). See also *Joliet Contractors Association et al. v. NLRB* (202

¹ 29 U. S. C., sec. 151 et seq. The language of the boycott section, 8 (b) (4), is quoted in full on the inside of the back cover.

² For example, the entire area of secondary consumer or customer boycotts is not covered. See footnote (25), *infra*.

³ See, e. g., 8 (b) (4) (C) and 8 (b) (4) (D) which relate to primary recognition strikes and jurisdictional disputes respectively.

⁴ There is relatively little in the way of basic literature on secondary boycotts. Two of the more detailed but somewhat out-of-date surveys are H. W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle*, 1913, and Leo Wolman, *The Boycott in American Trade Unions*, 1916.

⁵ For background material, see Frankfurter and Greene, *The Labor Injunction*, 1930, and Teller, *Labor Disputes and Collective Bargaining*, secs. 199-233.

⁶ For additional material on Congressional intent, see House Conference Report No. 510 on H. R. 3020 (pp. 43, 44) and majority opinion written by Mr. Justice Burton in *NLRB v. Denver Building and Construction Trades Council* (341 U. S. 675, 686).

stated that neither the first amendment nor section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act protects the inducement of unlawful secondary boycotts, even by peaceful means.²⁴

(b) Inducement of the employees of a secondary employer at or near the premises of a primary employer has been held by the Supreme Court and the Board to be lawful activity.²⁵ Hence, those who deliver or pick up goods from a primary employer may be solicited with impunity to refuse to perform work.

(c) This primary situs theory has been extended by the Board to permit the inducement of the employees of a secondary employer, even at the premises of a secondary employer, so long as the activity which is the objective of the inducement is to take place at the premises of the primary employer.²⁶

(d) Another ramification of the primary situs theory is its application to the activities of the primary employer conducted away from the principal place of business as, for example, work performed at or near the premises of another employer. The NLRB has permitted "following the work" in certain situations.²⁷

(e) Unfair lists may, according to NLRB rulings, include primary employers but not secondary employers.²⁸

(f) Inducement of the employees of a secondary employer has been held lawful by the Board where such employees are covered by

F. 2d 606) for holding that union bylaws can constitute inducement and *Western, Inc.* (93 NLRB 336), for Board reversal of trial examiner's finding that resolutions passed at a union meeting constitute inducement.

²⁴ *International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 501, AFL, et al. v. NLRB* (341 U. S. 694, 701). See also Judge Learned Hand's careful analysis of the same problem in the same case, 181 F. 2d 34, and Judge Healy's opinion in *Printing Specialties and Paper Converters Union, Local 388, AFL, et al. v. Le Baron* (171 F. 2d 331). The most elaborate discussion by the NLRB is contained in *Wadsworth Building Co.* (181 NLRB 802).

²⁵ *NLRB v. The International Rice Milling Co., Inc., et al.* (341 U. S. 665); *The Pure Oil Company* (84 NLRB 315); *Rayan Construction Co.* (85 NLRB 417); *Cf. Lakeview Creamery Co.* (107 NLRB No. 144).

²⁶ *Interborough News Company* (90 NLRB 2135).

²⁷ For cases involving the following of trucks, see *Sealright Pacific Ltd.* (82 NLRB 271); *Schultz Refrigerated Service, Inc.* (87 NLRB 92); *Sterling Beverages, Inc.* (90 NLRB 401); *NLRB v. Service Trade Chauffeurs, Salesmen and Helpers, Local 145, et al.* (191 F. 2d 65); *The Howland Dry Goods Co.* (97 NLRB 123); *Hoosier Petroleum Co., Inc.* (106 NLRB No. 111); and *Washington Coca-Cola Bottling Works, Inc.* (107 NLRB No. 104). Generally speaking, picketing near the premises of the secondary employer has been permitted in these cases where the picketing is limited to times when the trucks of the primary employer are at the premises of the secondary employer, but the Board's decision in the Coca-Cola case may indicate the beginning of an effort to restrict the roving situs theory. For the tests which will be applied, see *Moore Dry Dock Co.* (92 NLRB 547). In construction industry cases, the general counsel has apparently been applying a test which would permit picketing of the job as long as the primary employer is performing work there and as long as the signs indicate the nature of the dispute. For a construction case, see *Richfield Oil Corp.* (95 NLRB 1191). See also trial examiner's report recently adopted by the Board in *New York Shipping Assn.* (107 NLRB No. 152).

²⁸ *The Grauman Co.* (87 NLRB 755); *Western, Inc.* (93 NLRB 336); *Kimsey Manufacturing Co.* (89 NLRB 1168).

a collective bargaining contract which contains a "hot cargo" clause permitting unionized employees to refuse to handle goods or equipment from an employer listed as unfair.²⁹

3. To be unlawful, the inducement must be directed toward "the employees of any employer in the course of their employment":

(a) The term "employee" is carefully defined by section 2 of the act. Although the matter is not completely settled, the inducement of employees not falling within the statutory definition is in some cases, at least, unlawful.³⁰

(b) The inducement must be directed to employees "in the course of their employment." Thus, the Board and the courts have held that the inducement of prospective employees is not unlawful.³¹

4. To be unlawful, the purpose of the inducement of the employees of the secondary employer must be to bring about "a strike or concerted refusal [to perform work] in the course of their employment":

(a) Supreme Court and NLRB decisions have held that the solicitation of a single employee at or near the premises of the primary employer is not unlawful because it does not seek to induce concerted activity.³²

(b) Individual employees may quit their jobs or refuse to perform work, but a mass quitting has been held to amount to a strike or concerted refusal to perform work.³³

(c) The inducement of employees to refuse in concert to work on particular goods or equipment marked "unfair" by a union sometimes called a product boycott, is unlawful.³⁴

(d) A union-induced concerted refusal to buy the products of a secondary employer, generally referred to as a secondary consumer boycott, is not unlawful under the present act.³⁵

²⁹ *Conway's Express* (87 NLRB 130, en'd. 195 F. 2d 906); *Ferro-Co. Corp.* (102 NLRB No. 166); petition for injunction denied, *Douds v. Sheet Metal Workers International Assn., Local Union No. 28* (101 F. Supp. 273); motion for reconsideration denied (101 F. Supp. 970). *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.* (105 NLRB No. 120). *Western, Inc.* (93 NLRB 336).

³⁰ For supervisory exclusions see *Conway's Express* (87 NLRB 130, en'd. 195 F. 2d 906); *Arkansas Express, Inc.* (92 NLRB 255); *Roy Stone Transfer Corp.* (100 NLRB 856). For railroad employees, see *The International Rice Milling Co., Inc., et al. v. NLRB* (183 F. 2d 21), reversing 84 NLRB 360. *Cf. Di Giorgio Wine Co., et al.* (87 NLRB 125, en'd. 191 F. 2d 642), where a union admitting to membership only agricultural workers was held not to be a labor organization within the meaning of the act.

³¹ *Joliet Contractors Association* (99 NLRB 1291), petition for review of NLRB dismissal of portion of complaint denied, *Joliet Contractors Association et al. v. NLRB* (202 F. 2d 606). *Cf.* trial examiner's report recently adopted by the Board in *New York Shipping Assn.* (107 NLRB No. 152).

³² *NLRB v. The International Rice Milling Co., Inc., et al.* (341 U. S. 665). *Joliet Contractors Assn. et al. v. NLRB* (202 F. 2d 606). *Gould and Prentiss* (82 NLRB 1195). *Clyde M. Furr* (98 NLRB 1288). *Hammermill Paper Co.* (100 NLRB 1176).

³³ *Roane-Anderson Co.* (82 NLRB 696). ³⁴ *Climax Machinery Co.* (NLRB 1243); *Kanawha Coal Operators' Association* (94 NLRB 173); *Sound Shingle Co.* (101 NLRB 1159).

³⁵ *NLRB v. Service Trade Chauffeurs, Salesmen & Helpers, Local 145, et al.* (191 F. 2d 65); *Hoover Co. v. NLRB* (191 F. 2d 380); *Crowley's Milk Co.* (102 NLRB No. 102, en'd.); (33 LRRM 2110); November 13, 1953 (C. C. A. 3). *Capital Service, Inc.* (100 NLRB 1092). *Cf. Capital Services, Inc., et al. v. NLRB* (204 F. 2d 848).

5. "An object" of the inducement of a refusal to perform work must be one of the following if it is unlawful:

(a) Forcing an employer or self-employed person to join a labor or employer organization.³⁶

(b) Forcing one employer to cease doing business with any other person.³⁷

(1) If the primary and secondary employers are not doing business with each other, then inducement of the employees of the secondary employer is not unlawful under this particular section of the act. Consequently, the so-called sympathy strike, where there is no business relationship between employers, is not unlawful.

(2) Where two companies were controlled by substantially the same ownership interests and there was a functional integration between the two companies, the inducement of the employees of the secondary employer was held to be lawful.³⁸

(3) It is well settled that a subcontractor and general contractor are "doing business with" each other.³⁹ Consequently, one may not be picketed to put pressure on the other.

(4) A primary employer, who, during the course of a strike farmed out its work to a secondary employer, was held not to be doing business with the secondary employer where the primary employer's supervisors and others moved over to the secondary employer's premises to direct the accomplishment of the work. Picketing of the secondary employer's premises was permitted.⁴⁰

(5) The secondary employer must be a person as that term is defined in the act if a finding of violation is to be made. The NLRB has found an agency of the Federal Government and a local school board to be outside the definition.⁴¹

(c) Forcing any other employer to bargain with a union unless the union has been certified by the Board as the bargaining agent.⁴²

(1) This objective encompasses what is sometimes referred to as a secondary recognition strike.

6. Inducement for the following objectives is also unlawful although not involving traditional types of secondary boycotts:

(a) Forcing an employer to bargain with one union when another union has been certified as the bargaining agent for the same employees.⁴³

(1) Not a secondary boycott in the traditional sense. The wording prevents a union from inducing the employees of a primary

³⁶ There has been only one decision by the Board involving this particular paragraph of the act. *Lakeview Creamery Co.* (107 NLRB No. 144).

³⁷ *Schenley Distillers Corp.* (78 NLRB 504, en'd. 178 F. 2d 584). *Hoosier Petroleum Co., Inc.* (106 NLRB No. 111). *NLRB v. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, etc.* (184 F. 2d 60).

³⁸ *Irwin-Lyons Lumber Co.* (87 NLRB No. 9).

³⁹ *NLRB v. Denver Building Trades Council* (341 U. S. 675).

⁴⁰ *Douds v. Metropolitan Federation of Architects, etc.* (75 F. Supp. 672).

⁴¹ *Sprys Electric Co.* (104 NLRB No. 147); *Al J. Schneider* (87 NLRB 79).

⁴² *The Howland Dry Goods Co., et al.* (85 NLRB 1037, sup. dec., 97 NLRB 123). It should be noted that there need be no doing-business-with relationship between the primary and secondary employer in applying this section of the act. Thus, theoretically a secondary sympathy strike for this objective might be unlawful. See also *United Brick & Clay Workers of America, et al. v. Deena Artware, Inc.* (198 F. 2d 637).

⁴³ *Oppenheim Collins & Co., Inc.* (83 NLRB 355); *International Union, United Auto Workers of America, Local 447 (AFL)* (95 NLRB 957); *Gamble-Skogmo, Inc.* (93 NLRB 1638).

employer to refuse to perform work with the objective of compelling the primary employer to grant recognition where another union has already been certified. This is the only type of primary recognition strike made unlawful by this section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

(b) Forcing an employer to assign work to one group of employees rather than to another.³⁴

(1) This objective does not involve a traditional type of secondary boycott. It relates rather to work jurisdiction problems—that is, a quarrel among unions as to who shall perform certain types of work.

VII. NLRB JURISDICTION IN SECONDARY BOYCOTT CASES

1. It is well established that the NLRB has been given by Congress the power to remedy unfair labor practices in all businesses (aside from stated exceptions) within the reach of the commerce clause of the Constitution.³⁵ (a) Thus, companies whose business affects interstate commerce as well as those actually engaged in interstate commerce can be subject to the NLRB's jurisdiction. In the area of "affecting commerce" there is some dispute as to just how far the Federal authority extends.³⁶

2. The NLRB does not exercise jurisdiction to the fullest extent conferred by Congress:

(a) The Board has developed a set of yardsticks, based principally on dollar value of business, which are used to determine whether jurisdiction will be asserted in particular cases.³⁷

(b) In secondary boycott cases, that portion of the secondary employer's business affected by the dispute will be added to the primary employer's in determining the base for applying the yardsticks.³⁸

TAFT-HARTLEY'S SECONDARY BOYCOTT PROHIBITION

"Sec. 8 (b). It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—
 " * * * (4) to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is: (a) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person; (b) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (c) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (d) forcing or requiring any employer to

assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class, unless such employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under this act."

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, another loophole stems from the practice of ambulatory picketing—the practice of strike pickets in following the trucks of the picketed employer and then going into action at every point where the truck stops. The clear objective of the union here is to embarrass and bring pressure to bear on innocent third persons.

It would be possible to go indefinitely and cite dozens and hundreds of cases where secondary boycotts now flourish in absolute disregard of the law.

Mr. President, a moment ago, when I obtained the floor, I indicated to the Senate, and to the Senator from Nebraska, who had just completed his excellent discussion, that on February 9, 1954, I introduced a bill, S. 2989, in the Senate.

I ask unanimous permission at this time to offer and have printed in the RECORD my remarks on that occasion, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 2, page 2069.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL CONCERNING HIS AMENDMENT TO THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947 DEALING WITH SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Eight years ago, many Members of the United States Senate devoted long hours and back-breaking effort to enact one of the most difficult and complex pieces of social legislation ever to be placed on the statute books. This legislation has become known as the Taft-Hartley Act. It bears the name of the man who, more than any other, was responsible for its passage—a man who is revered by his colleagues and, yes, by the Nation, as one of the great statesmen of our time, the late Senator from Ohio, Robert A. Taft.

I have given considerable study to President Eisenhower's January 11 message on Taft-Hartley amendments. It is my conclusion that the President has found the true middle ground in this controversial subject. I am in enthusiastic agreement with his statement that the Taft-Hartley Act is sound legislation. I am convinced that the President's recommendations in no way detract from the basic purposes of that act. I have every confidence that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will shortly report a bill incorporating the recommendations of President Eisenhower. It is my intention to support this bill.

The objective of the Taft-Hartley Act was to set up a fair and equitable framework in which management and labor could settle their own problems in a manner consistent with the best interests of all the citizens of this great country. No one who is even slightly acquainted with the complexities of labor-management relations and the intense fervor of competing interests could fail to

appreciate the difficulty of achieving this objective.

In my humble opinion, we can, on the basis of 8 years of experience, look back with pride at the job that was done in 1947. The objective was achieved in most important respects.

In the debate that preceded the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, two problems vied with each other for the most attention. They were the closed shop and secondary boycotts. In both cases, the exhaustive testimony presented to the Senate and House committees clearly established the substantive evils represented in these two issues. In passing the Taft-Hartley Act Congress sought to eradicate these evils.

With the indulgence of my fellow Senators, I shall say a few words about one of these problems—secondary boycotts. The problem is still with us today.

The President prefaced his recommendations on secondary boycott restrictions with the statement, "The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted." I intend to point out today that there are a number of indefensible secondary boycotts which the present law does not touch. I will then introduce a bill which seeks to cover these situations. My bill, in effect, is an amendment to the Smith bill, S. 2650, upon which hearings have just concluded. It is my hope that the committee will incorporate my bill in the bill it will report to the Senate.

An editorial appearing on December 18, 1953, in the Topeka Dairy Capital poses the problem when it states, "The Taft-Hartley Act was supposed to prohibit secondary boycott, but smart union leaders and the lawyers have found loopholes in the law."

The problem is with us today because President Eisenhower in his labor message has recommended three changes in the secondary boycott provisions of the act, all of which are concessions to unions. I have checked to determine just what my party promised during the 1952 campaign with respect to secondary boycotts. I found that the only speeches which might be said to commit my party on this subject were made by Senator Taft. Speaking on behalf of the candidacy of President Eisenhower at Benton Harbor, Mich., on September 24, 1952, the late Senator said the law should be amended, too, and I quote: "Amendment of the secondary boycott provisions both to cure inequities and to close loopholes."

Last fall a Kansas City television station began a series of broadcasts of the fights which were regularly held in a local building. The employees of the TV station did not want to join a union. However, the employees of the building in which the fights were held were unionized. The business agent of the building employees called on the manager of the building and told him to get the TV employees into a union or take the television cameras out. The TV manager thought that was a secondary boycott until he consulted his lawyer. He then learned that it was a secondary boycott but it was not covered by present law.

We had another example in the Kansas City area last summer. A manufacturer of prefabricated houses entered into contracts with a number of builders to erect a large number of such houses. The prefabricated manufacturer had a contract with the Carpenters Union in his plant, but he had refused to agree to a compulsory membership contract. The business agent for the Carpenters Union in the Kansas City area went to the builders and told them he would not permit them to use the products of the manufacturer. This was his way of forcing the manufacturer to agree to a union shop in a plant located over a thousand miles from Kansas City. Here again present law provides no relief.

Here is another one. This is happening right here in the small town of Augusta, Kans., to a small manufacturer. I quote from the letter of this constituent of mine.

³⁴ *Herzog, et. al. v. Parsons* (181 F. 2d 781).

³⁵ *Polish National Alliance v. NLRB* (322 U. S. 643); *NLRB v. Denver Building and Construction Trades Council* (341 U. S. 675).

³⁶ *Shore v. Building and Construction Trades Council of Pittsburgh, Pa., et al.* (173 F. 2d 678); *Denver Building and Construction Trades Council v. NLRB* (186 F. 2d 326).

³⁷ *Federal Dairy Company, Inc.* (91 NLRB 638); *Dorn's House of Miracles, Inc.* (91 NLRB 82). See also NLRB release of October 6, 1950, entitled "N. L. R. B. Clarifies and Defines Areas in Which It Will and Will Not Exercise Jurisdiction."

³⁸ *Jamestown Builders Exchange* (93 NLRB 386); *Lincoln Beer Distributors (Earl Van)* (106 NLRB No. 76).

"We are currently in the 12th week of a UAW-CIO strike against our company, called because we would not agree to compulsory union membership. We began limited production 4 days after the strike began, and today we are operating normally with a full complement of workmen. However, we still have pickets out front, and the strike has boiled down to two weapons now being used by the union. Both of them involve secondary boycott. First, they have approached our customers and made every effort to incite our customer employees not to use our equipment. Second, they have enlisted the aid of other unions in an attempt to prevent consignments moving to and from our plant. Neither of these has been very successful; however, it has been and still is a constant battle to keep the supply lines open and to keep our customers satisfied."

Some of the activities described in the letter I have just read may be illegal under present law. But many of them are not. The trucking companies are not accepting cargo for delivery to his plant and are refusing to stop at his plant to pick up cargo because they have contracts with their union that they will not carry "hot cargo." The NLRB has ruled such contracts to be legal. My bill seeks to overrule that decision.

Now I come to a situation even more disturbing to me. No group has a greater stake in a strong ban on secondary boycotts than the American farmer. Yet decisions of the NLRB have stripped the farmer of any protection. His employees are not employees under the act for any purpose. A case establishing that principle involved a California grower. The union had been unsuccessful in organizing the grower's employees. It then persuaded the employees of the winery to strike to compel the winery to cease using the grapes produced by the grower. On these facts, the case would seem to fall squarely within the language of the present law. However, present law uses the term "employees," and agricultural employees are excluded from the definition of employees in the definition section of the law. To cure that loophole, my bill substitutes the word "person" for the word "employees."

Farm organizations are alerting their membership to the secondary boycott problems.

I am quoting from a pamphlet distributed by the American Farm Bureau Federation just last week.

"A secondary boycott is coercion brought against one employer to stop him from doing business with another employer involved in a labor dispute. The Taft-Hartley Act states it is an unfair labor practice.

"This provision of the act has been seriously weakened. The National Labor Relations Board has, by a series of rulings, practically repealed this section of the act.

"Farm Bureau favors strengthening the provisions of the act relating to secondary boycotts. Effective remedies, including private redress."

Again quoting from the current issue of the Nation's Agriculture, where there appears a two-page story devoted to the secondary boycott:

"A secondary boycott is a boycott by a party not directly involved in a labor-management dispute.

"For example, if a dairy workers' union were trying to organize workers on dairy farms in a certain area and the teamsters' union stopped hauling milk from such farms, this would be a secondary boycott.

"If the milk company refused to accept the milk, or if the workers of the milk company refused to work if milk from such dairy farms was received, either of these actions would be a secondary boycott.

"Secondary boycotts are prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act. The National Labor Relations Board is directed to seek an immediate injunction against any secondary boycott.

"It would be wrong, however, to assume that the Taft-Hartley Act has resulted in stopping secondary boycotts.

"Actually, the use of secondary boycotts is widespread. They are a very common feature of many, perhaps most, labor controversies. The threat of a secondary boycott is an extremely powerful force, even when no secondary boycott is actually undertaken.

"The major reasons for the widespread use of secondary boycotts is that their intended purpose is often fully accomplished long before the NLRB can obtain injunctive action and because the NLRB has found, during the years since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, often by strained interpretation of the intent of Congress, numerous loopholes which have almost made the act's prohibition of secondary boycotts a dead letter.

"The biggest hole in the act was breached when the NLRB ruled that if the union and employer had a contract which sanctioned secondary boycotts, this overrode the prohibition of the act.

"For example, if the Teamsters Union has a contract with employers permitting them to refuse to cross a picket line, they may use this to deny trucking services to any plant undergoing a labor controversy.

"This is just one of many NLRB interpretations which have virtually nullified the intent of Congress to prohibit secondary boycotts."

While it can be documented that there is no business which cannot be ruined by a secondary boycott, it is small business, the retailer, the main streets of America, that is the most vulnerable. A retailer cannot exist with a picket line out in front. His customers do not even read the signs the pickets carry. It is so easy to avoid inconvenience by going across the street to shop. And having found what they wanted in the other store, they perhaps never come back to that picketed dealer. Retailers know these hard facts of life. When the union calls the small retailer on the phone and says to "take all of Schultz bread off your shelves," the retailer is inclined to comply. Schultz may tell him that the union is doing this to force Schultz to require his unwilling employees to join the union, but the retailer has to think about self-preservation.

Perhaps the retailer has more intestinal fortitude. He continues to handle Schultz' bread. Then the union follows Schultz' trucks and pickets the driver while he is delivering the bread to the retailer. Now the retailer has real trouble. He has that picket line out in front. It is a secondary boycott, but decisions of NLRB hold it is not covered by the act. The Board held that Schultz' truck is a part of his plan of business—that the union is still picketing Schultz wherever it finds him and that it may legally do so. My bill seeks to close that loophole.

Let me read a short editorial appearing on the front page of the Bunker Hill Press, which says on its masthead that it is in the richest farming community in northern Indiana:

"Secondary boycotting' may be a meaningless term to most of us, but to a small-business man it may mean ruin. As, for instance:

"An ex-GI saved \$1,000, got a truck and a partner, and started a delivery service. The partners worked hard, prospered, hired three other drivers.

"In stepped a Truckdrivers Union boss, demanding that the young partners and their three employees fork over \$100 each and join the union. Already getting more than union scale, the employees refused. The union boss then demanded that the two partners pay the whole \$500. They refused.

"The union then began a secondary boycott—picketing the firm's customers. Thus pressured, the customers went elsewhere—and the firm went under.

"The Taft-Hartley Act's ban on secondary boycotts was intended to prevent such ruinous attacks on business. But it has been ineffective. It should be strengthened—and enforced."

Let us review briefly the reasons behind the attempt by the Congress in 1947 to eradicate the evils of secondary boycotts.

Testimony before both labor committees in 1947, is filled with examples showing how many innocent people were injured and even how some killings resulted from secondary boycott activity of unions.

There was the case of Edward and Robert Hunt who had a motor freight business in Philadelphia in 1945. They hauled principally for the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

As a result of organizational violence, a union member was killed, and Edward A. Hunt was tried for the homicide and acquitted.

Shortly thereafter, A. & P. signed a closed-shop agreement with the Teamsters Union and all the contract haulers signed, except the Hunts.

The Hunts wanted to sign, but the Teamsters wouldn't permit them to do so.

The union wouldn't permit their employees to join; nor would the union permit any goods to be hauled for any persons who contracted with the Hunts.

Confronted with the boycott which was threatening and accomplishing utter destruction of their business, the Hunts sought a Federal court injunction against the union activities.

When the case finally reached the Supreme Court in 1945, the court held that the arbitrary destruction of a business by a labor union, through its closed shop and a secondary boycott, violated no Federal law, and that the Federal courts were without power to interfere.

There is a serious question of whether the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley law would have stopped the Teamsters in the Hunt case if they had been in effect.

Certainly, NLRB and the courts have held that the Taft-Hartley ban does not stop the coercion and intimidation of secondary employers, which was what happened to Hunt's customers.

I shall not impose upon the time of my distinguished colleagues to document the legislative history supporting the conclusion that Congress intended in passing section 8 (b) (4) of the Taft-Hartley Act to do away once and for all with secondary boycotts. Senator Taft stated this intent many times. It has been accepted as a fact by both the NLRB and the courts.

The clear intent of Congress has not been carried out. The will of this great legislative body has been frustrated and circumvented by devious interpretations by the NLRB and the courts and by shrewd stratagems developed by powerful unions. Yes, I say to you, secondary boycotts are still with us today. It is for us to see that the job that was started in 1947 is carried through to a successful conclusion without further delay. I am therefore presenting to the Senate for consideration a bill which will, in my opinion, achieve the objective which we all seek—the eradication of secondary boycotts.

I was happy to see our great President say in his message on labor matters to the Congress that the true secondary boycott is indefensible. This was the prevailing view of the United States Senate in 1947. It was the prevailing view, in my opinion, of the great majority of our citizens, including many of those who are members of labor unions. I think the same view is still held by most people today.

I might interpose at this point, just a brief word on the subject of unions. I am not against labor organization. I am for the principles of free, collective bargaining. My

quarrel with unions, or with anyone else for that matter, arises only when they seek to use unfair methods that trample on the rights which all of us hold dear. The secondary boycott is such a method. I am unalterably opposed to its use.

I have prepared a more detailed explanation of my bill which I wish to now insert in the Record as a part of my remarks.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the remarks I made on that occasion and the matters which were presented in my discussion are as true today as they were at that time.

Have we reached the stage where labor leaders have become so powerful that it is impossible for Congress to protect the rights of innocent persons and the public?

If the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is adopted, as it certainly should be, we can end this practice, which is so harmful to our people. We have a compelling responsibility to do it, and to do it now.

I support the Senator's amendment because it seeks to restore the protection to innocent persons which we originally intended in the Taft-Hartley Act. This is in the public interest. It will limit the area of industrial strife by preventing a labor dispute from involving hundreds of persons not even remotely concerned with a strike. Why should these people be victims of a squeeze play in industrial warfare?

Unless we stop the evil practices of secondary boycotts now, we may have to contend with a much more serious condition in the future. With unions making alliances with other unions, and with the growth of industrywide bargaining, the time could come when wide areas of economic life could be crippled and the Nation seriously endangered. This is the inevitable end of the secondary boycott technique.

I support the Senator's amendment because the secondary boycott hits the people who are most vulnerable. The small-business man, the retail store, and the other enterprises forming the backbone of America, cannot withstand an attack of this kind. They are its innocent victims.

I digress from my prepared statement to say further that in my speech before the Senate at the time I introduced the measure several years ago it was pointed out that the National Farm Bureau Federation took action in order to get certain definite improvements in the Taft-Hartley Act, and one of them involved suggestions on secondary boycott. Those matters are set out in the article which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The mere appearance of pickets in front of places of business often leads the public to avoid doing business with them, even though they are innocent of wrongdoing. This is a form of blackmail as much as it is a boycott.

Such a practice is wholly repugnant to a free democracy. It is a travesty on justice. It often leads to violence and untold damage. President Eisenhower declared it to be "indefensible and must not be permitted." We can stop it by adopting now the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask the clerk to read it. At the conclusion of the reading I desire to make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That effective at the close of morning business on Monday, April 28, 1958, the Senate resume the consideration of the bill S. 2888, to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, that during its further consideration, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That only those amendments that have heretofore been submitted as intended to be proposed and which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed shall be in order, and only then when proposed by their respective authors.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the event this agreement, which has been reached between the minority leader and myself, is agreeable to all other Members of the Senate, it will be our intention to have the yeas and nays on the present Knowland amendment, which is pending. The Senator from California expects to discuss the amendment for 15 or 20 minutes. Perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee will desire to reply for 5 or 10 minutes. Then we will vote and conclude our deliberations today.

We expect the Senate to convene on Monday at 11 o'clock, with the informal understanding that there will be no votes before noon. There will be a morning hour, when Senators may make insertions in the Record. We then plan to proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement about noon, and remain in session until late Monday evening. We hope to conclude consideration of the bill on Monday. If it is impossible to conclude consideration on Monday we shall continue consideration of the bill

on Tuesday, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

It is our intention to follow consideration of the pending bill with consideration of a very important measure, the military pay bill.

I hope the unanimous-consent agreement will be acceptable to Members of the Senate. If any Senator has any question to raise I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have no question to raise, and I certainly have no objection. I concur in the unanimous-consent request.

In order that my amendments, which I have prepared for offering to the bill, may be incorporated in and encompassed by the unanimous-consent agreement, I now send to the desk three amendments to S. 2888, which are in a different category from the amendments we have been discussing up to this time. These amendments deal specifically with the text of S. 2888.

I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is in control of consideration of the bill, so that he will realize that the amendments which are offered at this time deal with what I consider to be deficiencies in the bill. I am hopeful the amendments will be considered and accepted or rejected on their merits. They are in no sense the kind of proposals we have been discussing, which deal with other subjects.

For that reason Mr. President, I not only send these amendments to the desk and ask that they be printed for consideration on Monday, but since they are very brief I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the desk; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendments are on page 24, between lines 5 and 6. Insert a new section as follows:

INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

SEC. 13. It shall be unlawful for any officer, trustee, custodian, or employee of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan, or for any other person, to cause any of the assets of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan which is subject to the reporting requirements of section 6 of this act to be invested in any securities or other property acquired subsequent to the date of enactment of this act which a national banking association would be prohibited from purchasing for its own account under the provisions of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C. 24) and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency promulgated thereunder.

Redesignate sections 13 to 18, inclusive, and reference thereto, as sections 14 to 19, respectively.

On page 26, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(f) Any person who, during any period for which he is ineligible by reason of conviction of any offense against the laws of the

United States or of any State to vote in any election held under the laws of the State of his legal residence, holds office, acts, or serves as an officer, trustee, custodian, or employee of an employee welfare or pension plan required to be registered under this act, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

On page 22, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

(b) The Secretary shall examine each registration and report filed under this act. If as a result of such examination, the Secretary has cause to believe (A) that any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of this act or any rule or regulation thereunder, or any other provision of law, (B) that the assets of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan have been or are being invested, handled, or used, in an illegal, unsafe, or improper manner, or (C) that the information contained in the registration or report is incomplete or inadequate he shall conduct such further investigation as may be necessary to enable him to ascertain the facts with respect thereto. If he determines pursuant to such investigation that any provision of this act or of any other law has been violated he shall call such violation to the attention of the appropriate law enforcement officers. If the Secretary determines pursuant to such investigation that any of the assets of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan are being invested, handled, or used in an unsafe or improper manner he shall notify the officers of such plan or other persons responsible. Unless the practices with respect to which such notification is given are promptly discontinued, the Secretary is authorized to publish a report of such practices.

Redesignate subsections (b), (c), and (d) as (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one amendment deals with the problem of whether we should impose any regulations or restrictions on the manner in which the union funds are invested. I think we should. We should make applicable the rules of the national banking system in that category within the framework of the Kennedy bill.

The second amendment deals with the problem of how to keep criminals and crooks from getting their grasping hands on such funds. I have provided a one-paragraph amendment to the Kennedy bill which will deal specifically with that subject. I hope my friends in the Senate will consider the amendment on its merits. It is in no sense the kind of amendment to be considered later in the session.

We should accept or reject these amendments, and dispose of them for all time to come, since they deal with the bill presently under consideration.

The third amendment deals with the manner of filing reports. In my opinion it would strengthen the bill and the report system. It adds the suggestion that the Secretary shall not only receive the reports, but that he shall examine them, thus making sure that something is actually done.

I thank the majority leader.

Mr. ALLOTT rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Colorado if he has a question with respect to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. ALLOTT. Because of the confusion at the rear of the Chamber, it is very difficult to hear. As I understand,

the proposed unanimous-consent agreement would not preclude my taking the floor this afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It would not begin to operate until the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the proposed agreement is entered into, it will put all Senators on notice as to the time when they will need to be present.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the intention of the unanimous-consent request with respect to motions to lay on the table?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. All motions are allowed one hour; and in addition each leader controls 2 hours.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does that include motions to lay on the table?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It includes all motions except a motion to lay on the table. There can be no debate on a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to inquire if it is understood that no further amendments will be offered today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That provision is incorporated in the proposed agreement.

Mr. IVES. And there will be no further votes today, after the vote upon the pending amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have announced that there will be one vote, namely, on the Knowland amendment which is pending. However, as I understand, the proposed agreement applies to amendments now at the table, when called up by their respective authors.

Mr. IVES. And that provision will go into effect next Monday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should think it would apply as of the time the agreement is entered into.

Mr. IVES. Are there to be any votes on such amendments today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; only a vote on the pending Knowland amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the proposed unanimous-consent agreement restrict the offering of amendments now on the table?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The language is:

Only those amendments that have heretofore been submitted as intended to be proposed, and which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, shall be in order, and only then when proposed by their respective authors.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not seem to me to be good parliamentary practice to restrict the amendments to those printed as of a given time. Until a given amendment is disposed of, a Senator does not know whether or not he may wish to offer a different amendment. Is this not an unusual provision in a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We frequently enter into such agreements. The minority leader reviewed the situation with prospective authors of amendments. That is the only way we could obtain an agreement.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the majority leader inform us approximately how many amendments are on the table?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe there are approximately 32 or 33. There were 36, and I think 4 were voted upon. I am informed that there are now 35, and 3 new ones have been submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In fairness to the Senator, let me say that I have been informed that some of the authors do not plan to call up their amendments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the majority leader able to say whether or not there is an amendment printed and lying on the table dealing with the so-called right-to-work principle? I had understood that the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] intended to prepare such an amendment. This morning I was told that it had not been printed. I had assembled some material for a speech on that amendment if it were offered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may answer that question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest that the Senator from South Dakota confer with the Senator from Arizona with respect to his amendment. I do not have a copy of it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In answer to the question of the Senator from South Dakota, I have not submitted a right-to-work amendment. I have submitted an amendment which would remove the 30-day clause in the Taft-Hartley law, an amendment which in no way would affect section 14 (B) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My information may have been in error, but my understanding was that the Senator had prepared an amendment dealing with that subject, but that it had not actually been submitted, and therefore would not be in order under the terms of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My amendment is at the desk, but it is not a right-to-work amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Arizona contemplate offering a right-to-work amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not contemplate offering a right-to-work amendment. However, I have an amendment at the desk to remove the 30-day provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. The amendment would in no way affect section 14 (B).

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota was interested

in the original right-to-work provision incorporated in the labor legislation of 1946 and 1947. He would not want that provision weakened in any sense. I do not suppose that the Senator from Arizona would propose to weaken it. But if there were to be some amplification of it, and some modification of the law which permits States to operate in this field, I certainly would not wish to be foreclosed from speaking on the subject, and either opposing or supporting the amendment offered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that during all the time I have been a Member of this body I have been waging a constant battle not only to restore States rights, but to strengthen them. I am happy to find any Senator who is willing to join me in that fight. I want to strengthen the States rights provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act, as well as States rights provisions in all other legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, showing the various measures introduced from the 77th through the 80th Congresses.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
March 21, 1958.

RIGHT TO WORK—PROVISIONS INTRODUCED IN
77TH TO 80TH CONGRESSES

Seventy-seventh Congress (1941):

H. R. 6039: Unlawful for an employee or other person to force another person to join or remain a member of a labor organization or to refrain from engaging in employment.

Senate Joint Resolution 106, constitutional amendment: No person shall be denied employment because of present or past membership in a labor union, nor because of refusal to join a union.

Seventy-eighth Congress (1943):

H. R. 353, 1173, 2032, 2681: All concerned with declaring unlawful for any person, religious, service, political, fraternal, or labor organization to require membership as a condition of employment, or for any person or organization to force any person to become or remain a member.

Senate Joint Resolution 4, constitutional amendment: No person to be denied employment because of union membership or because of refusal to join a union.

Seventy-ninth Congress (1945):

H. R. 428: Unlawful for any person, labor organization, or any group, by force, coercion, etc., to force any person to become or remain a member of any labor organization, to refrain from employment or interfere with an employee while going to or from employment or seeking employment.

H. R. 429: Unlawful for any individual, association, governmental department, agency, or employee to require as condition precedent to employment that an individual become, be, or remain a member of any labor, fraternal or religious organization.

H. R. 1337: Similar to two bills above.

H. R. 1338: Similar to H. R. 429.

Seventy-ninth Congress (1946):

H. R. 5202, 5203, 5320, 5570: Similar provisions relating to making it unlawful to force any person to belong to a labor organization or to refrain from employment in industries affecting interstate commerce

H. R. 5334, New National Labor Relations Act: Lists among unfair labor practices that of a labor organization or employee to coerce any employee for the purpose of compelling such employee to join or refrain from joining any labor organization, to continue or to suspend, or to cease his employment.

H. R. 6536: Prohibits closed-shop agreements where the coercion of any American citizen to join a labor union or other association as condition of employment in industries affecting interstate commerce.

Eightieth Congress (1947):

H. R. 725 (Mr. CASE), Industrial Relations Act of 1947: No act of Congress shall be construed to impair any provision of State law prohibiting closed-shop contracts, which shall hereafter be subject to State regulation only.

Make it an unfair-labor practice for a representative of employees to interfere with employees' rights guaranteed in section 7 of the NLRA.

H. R. 830, National Labor Mediation Act: Rights of employees to be or not to be members of a labor organization protected.

H. R. 2748, Labor Act of 1947: Made labor organization subject to provisions of Clayton Act if one of its purposes was by strikes or violence to influence a person concerning union membership.

H. R. 3020 (Mr. Hartley), Labor Management Act of 1947: Union shop or maintenance of membership clauses authorized upon agreement by employer and if the agreement would not conflict with State law.

S. 105: No one seeking employment in interstate commerce to be required to join or remain a member of a labor organization, or to refrain from joining or remaining a member.

S. 327: Amends NLRA to make it an unfair-labor practice for an employer to discriminate against a person who has been denied or expelled from membership in a labor union for any reason except that of nonpayment of union dues.

S. 1126 (Mr. Taft), closed shops prohibited: Union shop could be established by collective bargaining, if majority of employees by secret vote favored it, but denial of membership in a union for any reason other than refusal to pay dues not grounds for discrimination against the employee by the employer.

MARY R. HESLET,
Economics Division.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader would yield to me, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If there is to be a limitation on debate on amendments, and no amendment is offered on the subject I have discussed, then the matter I have prepared could not be presented. I could present my material and discuss it only if I could have time yielded to me on an amendment or on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be happy to yield time to the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield time to the Senator from South Dakota on some of the amendments I do not plan to call up.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in the light of that assurance, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Which amendment are we discussing?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is the amendment identified as K. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not expect to take more than 15 or 20 minutes at the most, and then, following a discussion of the amendment, I believe we should be able to vote on it, perhaps within the next half hour.

Mr. President, we have laws in the country to restrain unfair practices. We have laws to govern labor representation and collective bargaining. We have laws to provide mediation. We have no laws which protect the basic rights of union members.

Great struggles took place on the political level over more than half a century to secure some of our present laws. Underlying every one of them is the sound principle that in a civilized nation there is no room for civil warfare between competing interest groups. That is the great goal of all law.

If existing law is not adequate, let us make it adequate. But let us remember that all law is a balancing of interests. It cannot favor one interest, one group, against other interests and other groups. It must balance them all in the public interest which is paramount.

Let us remember one thing about law. It can never be the perfect solution when it deals with human rights, human interests, and human relations.

This may bring some temporary hardship to labor or to management in industrial relations disputes. Neither can expect to get the whole of their demands through law.

What are they to do then? Aggrieved parties can press for more laws to bring them closer to the justice they feel they should have. Let no man say this is a futile remedy. The body of laws we have passed within the last 25 years to restrain employers and enlarge the rights of employees is eloquent witness to the response of our legislative bodies to justified appeals.

But one thing should never be done in a civilized country: Aggrieved parties should never take the law into their own hands. They cannot turn to violence without corrupting the whole ground they stand on. They cannot accept all the hard-won law intended to insure industrial peace, and then turn to violence and thereby destroy that peace.

This is a corruption of law. It is a corruption of government. It is a corruption of the good will with which the public accepted sacrifices in freedom of action to secure the higher goal of domestic peace through law. In union elections for the right to represent the workers in collective bargaining, for example, the minority gives up its independence for the sake of industrial peace. A whole list of concessions by workers, management, and the public easily could be drawn to show the sacrifices which have been made to secure the greater good of peace.

Violence may not be corruption in the same sense as stealing and embezzling union funds. But it is a form of corrup-

tion just the same, and it is just as bad. Violence is terrorizing and intimidation. Such tactics fall squarely within the definition of racketeering. The threat of it is blackmail. It corrupts the free-bargaining process by adding a sinister third party at the council table whose one contribution is: "You take this, or else." Raw power always destroys negotiation. Can this be for the public good? It is not good for management. It will not in the long run be good for labor. It will not be good for the general public. Collective bargaining must never become collective bludgeoning.

If we ever come to the point where one interest among many interests can assert its paramount will by violence, then the rule of law will be destroyed and anarchy will take over. This is the road to totalitarianism—Communist or Nazi. It is not the American constitutional method.

Strikes play an important part in industrial relations. The right to strike must never be foreclosed. Strikes are the ultimate weapon, but not the absolute weapon in labor disputes. They are the ultimate weapon because they are the last step in which labor can show its determination to better its conditions.

Strikes are not the absolute weapon, because they can never be the decisive force over all obstacles. The nature of strikes has changed over the years. Strikes in the past were really strikes of labor against management, employees against employer. Strikes today in some industries are vastly different in purpose, methods, and results. When accompanied by violence, they are no longer disputes only between labor and management. They take on the proportions of class warfare against the community, as in the case of steel, coal, railroads, telephones, longshoremen, bus, subway, and street-car strikes.

Must Government and the public, which have done so much to insure industrial peace, stand idly by while violence creeps in to destroy all that has been sought for by law?

In a letter to Thomas Jefferson, Madison wrote:

Wherever there is an interest and power to do wrong, wrong will generally be done, not less readily by a powerful and interested party than by a powerful and interested prince.

By resorting to violence, management and labor leaders show they have the power to do wrong. This should be a signal to the public that there is always a need to reestablish some checks and balances. Just as employer power had to be offset by Government and labor power, so today, excessive labor power over union members has to be offset by Government.

Law is a brake on power. Law alone represents the whole community and comes closest to nonpartisanship and justice. It is our system of government by laws and not by men that has preserved our democracy when in many other nations dictators who ruled by force have come and gone.

This session of Congress must pay heed to the McClellan committee recommendations. Somewhere, in our

committees, on the floor in Congress, in labor or in management, and among the public, there must be the courage, imagination, and statesmanship to look at this problem of the rights of the Nation's workers afresh and come up with some workable proposals.

I want to make a few remarks about the problem of labor in politics.

There is always some hesitation in discussing a subject like labor in politics. If we are critical or unsympathetic about what labor leaders do in politics, we are immediately branded "anti-labor." Yet are we to stand idly by if we see harm to working people and to our political system by what labor politicians do?

The problem goes much deeper than I am prepared to discuss today. The whole problem of labor in politics warrants careful attention, because I firmly believe it holds great dangers for rank and file members.

In a sense, labor has always been in politics. I would not have it otherwise. Working people are important citizens of our country, whether they are in or outside of unions. They have important interests to protect and to advance.

This means that working people and the leaders they choose to represent them have every right to participate in politics in every legitimate way. The minimum they can do is to register and vote, as is the case with every other American citizen. But they are entitled to do much more. They can seek education on the issues, study the records of candidates and parties, join and work for political parties of their choice, and seek political office.

All of this is wholesome and no problem. The real problem arises when certain labor leaders, more interested in political power than in labor's interests, use the labor movement for both management-labor relations and as a political machine.

Take notice that I am not precluding the right of labor to form a political party if their members so desire. I think such a development would be most unwise and harmful to labor's best interests, but I do not question their right to establish a labor party. But it should be done cleanly and in the open.

What I think is fundamentally wrong, I repeat, is the use of union structure as a political machine at the same time as that structure enjoys the statutory powers, rights, and privileges of a legitimate labor organization.

That is what certain labor leaders are doing, and there is where the trouble lies. No one has to prove the existence of a labor political machine cloaked in the guise of labor organization. The form and activities of COPE—AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education—supplemented by labor's political operations organized by regional, State, and local committees, the almost \$3 million reported as spent by labor unions in the 1956 election, and the large sums spent in politics without being reported, provide every element of a political party except the label.

In order to operate this two-toned model of a labor and political organiza-

tion, they have two sources of funds: So-called voluntary contributions collected from individual workers; and funds allocated out of dues paid into union treasuries. The contributions from workers are said to be voluntary. Undoubtedly some of them are; but anyone who knows the pressures union officials can exert upon workers beholden to them for jobs will be bound to discount at least some of these voluntary contributions. The funds from union treasuries are rarely the decision of the rank and file union members—certainly at most only a bare majority of them—but usually of the officials who direct union affairs.

Just as there are two sources of funds, so there are two methods of spending. Union treasury funds go for political education, and voluntary contributions go for direct political action. The reason for this distinction is to get around the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, which prohibit political contributions by unions as well as by corporations in Federal elections.

The distinction is not always fully observed, as in the UAW in Michigan which in 1954 spent union funds for radio and TV support of labor-favored candidates. Moreover, political "education" is only partially innocent of political favoritism; a good part of it is just as effective as direct political support to favored candidates. In addition, the use of union facilities and personnel in behalf of a candidate or a party, although unreported, is equal to a direct cash contribution and is, I believe much more effective.

Today, much of the strength, the powers, rights, and privileges of labor organizations are supported and guaranteed by law. That law, many Senators, if not all, have supported in one form or another, both in this Chamber or in the other body.

This force of Government was not put behind labor organizations to enable them to establish a political party, but to help them in the field of labor-management relations.

Whenever a majority of workers in an industrial plant choose a particular union to represent them, all other workers in the plant are compelled to go along. The minority are compelled, in union contract situations, to pay union initiation fees and dues in order to work.

In these circumstances, it is fundamentally wrong for union officials, or even for a union majority, to devote union funds for political purposes determined by union political organizations. The law does not compel union workers to join unions and pay dues for any political purpose—thinly disguised education, direct political action, or otherwise. The minority in a union should not be compelled to pay dues for the opportunity to work, only to have their money diverted to political action against themselves for what they deem, in their own consciences, to be against their own best interests. It does not build up union strength in order to give union officials the power to coerce workers into so-called voluntary political action.

Aware that they are doing wrong, union politicians soothe their consciences by saying a worker can direct his voluntary contribution to any political party of his choice. This is nonsense and they know it. Workers know what would happen to them if they tried this. The fact that about 99 percent of union political funds go to the support of one party shows it is nonsense. Moreover, even if a few workers are bold enough to exercise the privilege, the funds of the union treasury and the whole weight of union power are cast in the balance against them.

Aside from the improper use of union funds in politics, the union movement stands to lose a great deal by being thrust into political action by a few of its leaders who seek political power. Legitimate union goals and operations are bound to suffer when union officials use the movement for political ends.

Union officials should stay within the intent of the law and use their power for industrial relations, or else surrender their legal privileges if they want to act like a political party. They should not be permitted to mount a political movement piggy back on a law-supported, legitimate labor movement.

In summary, Mr. President, this session of Congress has an urgent public responsibility to enact legislation which first, guarantees the election of union officials by secret ballot; second, provides for the recall of union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility; third, prevents conspiracies between management and union officials that work against the welfare of union members; fourth, protects union members' welfare and pension programs; fifth, requires that where unions are permitted, under law, to represent all employees in an industry or plant, all employees must be admitted into the union if they should desire union membership; sixth, provides that union members shall have a voice in the conditions, terms, and duration of strikes; seventh, prevents arbitrary control over local unions of trustees appointed by national or international organizations; and, eighth, provides for regulation by union members of the actions of their unions on questions of excessive union fees, assessments or arbitrary actions.

Individual workers, men and women, stand to gain by each of these pieces of legislation. The public interest requires them. If we value industrial peace and the free institutions which preserve our liberties, this Congress will enact them.

Mr. President, I ask that my amendment designated "4-21-58-K" be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

Sec. —. Subsection (a) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new sentences at the end thereof: "No labor organization which does not admit to membership all of the employees it seeks to represent in a unit appropriate for that purpose, on the same terms and conditions generally and

uniformly applicable to and with the same rights and privileges generally and uniformly accorded to all the members thereof, shall be a representative of any employee in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of this section. Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed to prevent a labor organization from denying membership to any person on the ground that such person is a member of the Communist Party or that he believes in, or is a member of an organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under section 9 (a) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the labor representative selected by the majority of the employees for the purpose of collective bargaining is designated as the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees in the bargaining unit.

This amendment provides that when a union organization is selected to be the exclusive bargaining representative in the plant or firm involved, this privilege will be conditioned on the union's opening up its membership to all the employees in the bargaining unit, if they should choose to join, and on the same terms and conditions as the ones which apply to the present members of the labor organization.

This amendment is designed to eliminate an existing situation in certain unions where either employees are barred from taking out membership in the union representing them or where the union has, in effect, set up a closed system of membership, under which only union members of a certain class are permitted to vote and to participate in all the union's activities, although all of its members must pay the initiation fees and the dues.

In order that the amendment might not be used by subversive elements, there is included a provision to the effect that nothing in the amendment shall be construed to prevent any labor organization from denying membership to members of the Communist Party or members of organizations that advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by unconstitutional methods.

The amendment would prohibit any existing discrimination against employees on the grounds of age, sex, religion, nationality, or race.

If unions are interested in eliminating discrimination practices in the United States, they should be favorably disposed toward the amendment.

As to the necessity and desirability of the adoption of such an amendment, let me say that at the hearings which were held by the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field—and now I shall read from page 437 of those hearings—the following appears under the heading "Findings—International Union of Operating Engineers":

In the American labor movement the International Union of Operating Engineers stands out as an ugly example of ruthless domination of working men and women through violence, intimidation, and other dictatorial practices.

The hearings of this committee concerning the activities of the Operating Engineers Union clearly demonstrated the lack of democratic procedures within that union and exposed to public view the ruthless ends to which the union's leadership will go to stifle any semblance of democratic action.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at this point, will the distinguished Senator from California yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Does not the Taft-Hartley Act provide for some control over such an abuse, unless the question is one of the technical qualifications of the workers concerned? In the case of the Operating Engineers, there is a requirement, based on a technical qualification, as to persons who wish to become affiliated with the union. Does not the Taft-Hartley Act apply if there is found to be discrimination not based on a matter of qualifications?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not believe that is covered.

Mr. THYE. I followed the explanation and the statement the distinguished majority leader made prior to his submission of the amendment. The statement he made before he submitted the amendment covered all labor fields.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; I was making a general statement, prior to calling up the amendment. Then I called up the amendment, and had it read.

Mr. THYE. That was confusing to me, inasmuch as I had understood that the Senator's amendment designated by the letter "K" was to be the pending amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, it is the pending amendment. I made the other statement on the broader fields, but that statement had nothing to do with this particular amendment.

Mr. THYE. That was the reason for the confusion. I requested the Senator to yield to me because I could not understand how the remarks the distinguished Senator from California made prior to calling up the amendment had any particular bearing on it. I had understood that he was addressing himself to his amendment "K," and I could not understand how the remarks he was making at that time related to the abuses covered by subsection (a) of section 9.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota is quite correct. I tried to make it clear—although perhaps the Senator from Minnesota did not hear me say so—that I would make a general statement, prior to calling up the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Very well.

I am very much concerned about the reference which has been made to the Union of Operating Engineers, particularly as to whether there have been discriminations against persons who were qualified to belong to such a specific union.

Of course, in the case of unions in technical fields, some workers could not

be affiliated with them unless they were qualified to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. Of course the section appearing on page 6 of the Taft-Hartley Act, Public Law 101, reads as follows:

Provided, That this paragraph shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein; or (B) an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances.

Mr. THYE. It is possible, of course, that a person who might seek membership in a certain labor organization or union might not be able to qualify for membership, and therefore the organization would not permit him to become a member. That is what I had in mind in this case, when reference is made to the fact that membership in a specific union was denied, or might be denied.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We only ask that some members not be placed in a preferred position—for instance, not be identified as Class A or Class B—when all the members pay the assessments or dues, but not all the members are permitted to vote.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from California for that explanation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I continue to read from page 437 of the interim report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field:

The hearings revealed, in the committee's opinion, these salient facts:

1. Democracy within this vital union is virtually nonexistent. Through an international constitution designed to give the membership as little voice as possible, only 46 percent of the union's 280,000 members are even allowed to vote for their own officers. Where elections are held, union leaders have shamefully deprived their members of their democratic rights through the indiscriminate stuffing of ballot boxes and rigging of elections.

2. Trusteeships have been imposed—for no apparent reason—as a means of continuing domination over the affairs of a number of locals of the International Union of Operating Engineers. The locals under trusteeship have been looted and their members deprived of their rights. Two locals in Chicago, Ill., have been under trusteeship for 29 years.

On page 438 of the same report, we find the following:

The committee finds that William DeKoning, Jr., and his late father, William DeKoning Sr., have operated local 138 on Long Island as a closed family corporation to suit their own interests without real regard for the rights of the membership. The committee finds that all opposition to the DeKonings was remorselessly suppressed, often in a violent manner. The example of Peter Battalio is a notable one in the committee's view. This rank-and-file member, who had the temerity to question the actions of local 138 officers, was viciously beaten by union goons in front of the local 138 union hall and hospitalized as a result.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota to give particular attention to this portion of the report:

As in the case with other IUOE locals, local 138 was split into various divisions—I. e., local 138, local 138A, and local 138B—and

only members of local 138 were permitted to vote for officers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from California yield again to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does not the Taft-Hartley Act apply in such cases?

Of course, it will be impossible for the Senator from California and me to keep men from fighting or striking one another if they so desire. Congress can provide penalties; and under the civil code there are laws which impose fines and provide corrective measures.

But the Senator from California and I could not prevent persons from fighting or from striking each other; even though the civil laws contain provisions of the sort to which I have referred, neither the Senator from California nor I could actually prevent such a quarrel or fight from occurring.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree that we could not prevent people from committing assaults, and so forth. In the respective States, those who have the police powers have that responsibility.

Sometimes they are lax in enforcing laws in the communities and in giving the protection which a citizen is entitled to have. I thought we would have to have, and I hope we shall have, an aroused public opinion in each locality over enforcing the statutes now on the books.

If there is any hiatus in the Taft-Hartley Act, as some of us believe there is, so that a union member is not able to have control over his own affairs, I think it is important that at least procedures ought to be established so that by his vote, and by having the privilege to vote, he can, if he is a good union citizen, clean up the mess in his own outfit. It is pretty hard for him if he has class B membership. He pays dues, initiation fees, and perhaps assessments, but does not have a chance to vote in elections or for the continuation in office of officials who are abusing their powers.

Mr. THYE. The Taft-Hartley Act defines and endeavors to cover such a situation; but all the act can do is designate what the law is. Again it becomes the responsibility of the civil authorities to fine or prosecute. The Senator from California and I could write bills that would reach from the Capitol to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, but we cannot legislate specific action to be taken by local authorities. We cannot legislate what the responsibility of the authorities shall be.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Taft-Hartley Act does not cover the matter under discussion. The Taft-Hartley law provides, and that provision still would not be changed so far as the amendment is concerned, that a union can set up qualifications for membership. If a union wants to provide that a person must have 10 years' instead of 1 year's employment, that qualification can be set up, but such a qualification should apply to everyone in the union. Employees should not be expected to pay dues and assessments and, even though they may have the same training and background and all

the other prerequisites of membership as other members, they should not be put aside as a second-class group of union citizens.

Mr. THYE. I have listened to the distinguished minority leader make the explanation. I have his amendment in my hand. I have endeavored to study the amendment. I am still in what might very well be called the twilight—

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will clear up the twilight, if the Senator will let me.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator knows, I have supported his other amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I appreciate the Senator's support. I can assure him, as I told the Senator and the entire Senate yesterday, the amendments I have offered—and I am speaking only for myself—are all directed toward helping to give the rank-and-file union member protection. The amendments do not lessen the influence of any union as against management. They are not meant to strengthen the hand of management as against unions. The amendments have been designed only to help give union members control over their own affairs.

Mr. THYE. The amendments which were offered yesterday, and which I supported, were specific and distinct. They declared and provided for democracy within unions. They were specific in other respects. I was able to support them without any reservations or question, because I thought they did justice to union members.

I will be frank with the Senator and say that I do not find the clear-cut, defined purpose in the pending amendment that I found in some of the others. For that reason, because it seems to be a civil-rights amendment, and because I cannot quite understand the civil-rights aspect of it, I have asked the questions. I shall not vote for any of the many amendments which will be offered unless I understand specifically what they propose to do, because there is so much involved in S. 2888 that I do not think unacceptable amendments should be adopted which might possibly destroy an opportunity to enact the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad the Senator has raised the question. I noted his votes on yesterday. I appreciate the support which he gave my amendments. I shall take only a few more minutes to complete my statement. After I complete it I shall endeavor to make perfectly clear that I think the amendment is specific and is directed to the subject the Senator has in mind. Basically, it is evident that under the Taft-Hartley Act, when a union has a majority of the workers in a plant, as the Senator knows, it has the right to bargain collectively for everybody in the plant. Every employee is then subject to pay union dues, under the union-shop proposition, which is still legal.

Mr. THYE. It is a question of a majority rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is a question of a majority rule, but it might be just 51 percent versus 49 percent.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from California and I have to abide by such a rule in this body.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We do, but we are dealing with government. I assume we have not established government within government. If there is a union shop contract, wherein a majority votes to have the union represent the employees, after a period of 30 days the other members must pay dues or initiation fees.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All we say is that under those circumstances, if the union is going to collect dues and initiation fees or assessments, as the case may be, the union should not discriminate against other employees. The union should admit those employees to membership on equal terms with other employees. The union should not establish class A or class B membership. That is basically what the question involves. Testimony was taken before the committee, some of which I have already read, more of which I intend to read, which indicated there have been such basic discriminations.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. Since the Senator from Minnesota has asked what sanctions or penalties might be involved if the law was being broken, the Senator might want to call attention to the fact that while destroying of civil rights may have to do with breaking of local laws, a very dire penalty is provided in the proposal, which is that the union would no longer be permitted to represent exclusively the employees the union had formerly been permitted to represent. I may say that is a very heavy penalty.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Am I correct in my understanding of the Senator's amendment K, which has just been read into the RECORD, that it means, in sum and substance, that all union members, in whatever unit or local, shall receive treatment equal to that given other members of that union? It is an equal treatment measure, is it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is an equal treatment amendment, both of union members in a union and in adjoining unions where the union claims a right to represent them in collective bargaining.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the right to join a union under a union shop agreement exist at this time under the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, it does not; and there have been notable examples where persons have been excluded from membership.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the union shop theory is not an employee required to join a union after a certain length of time of employment, in whatever unit or class?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. An employee is required to pay dues and fees, but a union can elect to keep him out of the union.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Even though the union accepts his dues?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Even though the union accepts his dues and even though

it has the power to represent him in collective bargaining. To that extent, the union takes away from that employee the right to represent himself in negotiating a contract.

I have no quarrel with that feature of the Taft-Hartley Act which gives the majority the right to represent all employees, because the argument which the unions used at the time, which has merit, was that if a union represented only 51 percent, and if it bargained only for the 51 percent, an employer might give a better arrangement to the 49 percent who did not join. That would tend to keep people out of the union and on the other side of the question. However, once the union obtains a majority and asks to bargain for all of them, it seems to me when they exercise the right to collect dues from these men, as well as initiation fees and all the other service charges, they should not exclude from membership the others who want to join the union.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say the Senator in his explanation of his amendment has put it in a light somewhat different than my understanding of it at the beginning of this discussion.

May I say further to the able Senator, I feel there is strength in the argument which has been made by the proponents of the bill, those who have opposed the amendments being offered, that consideration should be given to all parts of a bill or its amendments by committees. However, there are exceptions to that rule. Exceptions would be in those cases where we know the provision of an amendment is basically right, is innately right, and that no amount of testimony can change the purpose of such an amendment.

I refer, for example, to the amendment which was considered with reference to the right of members to vote and control the affairs of unions and have that right protected. Likewise, there was the amendment offered by the able Senator from California to provide for the punishment of those who would bribe or attempt to bribe officials of a union to the injury of the members. No one can doubt the soundest of these provisions, I submit; and no amount of evidence can change the virtue and soundness of them.

I have not voted for all of the amendments offered by the Senator from California, but I have voted for those amendments which I felt were innately right and basically sound, as to which hearings would not be necessary.

I feel in such instances we have a right, by amendments offered on the floor, to amend a bill. In other instances I feel the regular course of reference to a committee, with the taking of evidence and the hearing of witnesses, is much to be desired.

I am very glad to have the Senator's explanation, because it is somewhat different, as to amendment "K" from what I had first understood.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. It has been my privilege to be the colleague of the Senator from West Virginia on two occasions, now and during his former membership in this

body. Since the Senator has returned he has been one of the most valued Members of the Senate of the United States, an able and distinguished representative of the great State of West Virginia. I know the Senator always votes his convictions, based on what he feels is in the best interest of both the country and his State.

I have appreciated those votes of the Senator in which he felt he could support my proposals, and I know when he did not he had conscientious convictions as to why he could not.

I wish to thank the Senator for his remarks today and the contribution he has made to the discussion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate very much what my friend, the able minority leader, says. We have served on two different occasions together in the Senate. I know his sincerity of purpose and his fine ability in advocating his cause. I appreciate also the splendid leadership given to the minority by the able Senator from California.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from California would prevent the union from discriminating against an employee at the place of employment, when the union is the representative of the employees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the proposed amendment would prevent discrimination. Is there anything in the amendment which would prevent the employer from discriminating against one who might otherwise be eligible for membership in the union? If a man is not permitted to work, then he would not be eligible for membership in the union. Is there anything in the proposed amendment to overcome that type of discrimination? It seems to me the amendment applies to only one side of the question. If we are attempting to eliminate discrimination, then we ought to eliminate discrimination on the part of the employer, who might rule out certain persons.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment does not affect him at all?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. All the amendment does is to provide that when the union is the bargaining agent, and claims the right as such to represent all the employees within the bargaining unit, and in effect to tax all the members within the unit, when there is a union-shop contract, they should not thereby discriminate against an employee and keep him out of the union, depriving him of voting rights, at the time they are collecting dues from him and levying assessments on him.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. Suppose the union had some sort of an understanding aboveboard or sub rosa or otherwise, that the employer would not hire certain classes of employees they did not want in the union. Is there any way of overcoming a situation like that?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The proposed amendment under consideration does not

cover that field. We tried to make it clear that if the union claimed a right to represent the men and collect dues from them, the union should not prevent the men from becoming members of the union, at which time they could have a voice in the organization which claimed the right to represent all of them.

Mr. AIKEN. If the employer hired a person who the union might not think was a proper person in the union, the union would not be permitted to discriminate against him simply because they did not like his face, would they?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. How would the proposed amendment affect a union such as a craft union, in which a person might not be a member of the union but might receive a work permit in order to work? There would be an assessment for a work permit, which might or might not be the same as the dues. Many times such assessment is not the same as the regular dues of the union member. How would the Senator's proposed amendment affect that type of situation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The union of course would still have the right to raise its standards of membership. If it were desired to require so many years of experience, they could still do that. The only thing the amendment would require is that they apply the same standards to all employees within the bargaining unit.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, if a union had certain standards and had a provision for work permits, so that an individual could work perhaps on a temporary basis without being a member of the union as such, the amendment would have no effect on that status so long as it was a policy which was general throughout the union.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the man wanted to come into the union, and he had the qualifications to join, the amendment would prevent them from discriminating against him and keeping him out of the union, if they were levying dues and assessments against him.

Mr. POTTER. Even though the dues and assessments might not be the same as the regular members would have to pay?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. In reply to the Senator from Vermont, the Senator referred to the unions being discussed as unions having bargaining rights for union shops. The Senator does not wish to have it understood that the proposal is limited to union shops, does he?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What facts usually motivate the union to preclude full membership for those workers who pay dues? I cannot understand what would dissuade the union from permitting an

employee to join, if the employee is paying dues.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Well, the reason is that they wish to keep control in the hands of a particular group of officers; in other words, to keep a kind of closed corporation arrangement.

I was reading about a particular case. I am not sure whether the Senator was present or not. In that case several different locals were established, but only one of them was permitted to vote for officers. The committee testimony showed that there was no regular manner in which an operating engineer on Long Island could gain admission into the parent local 138, which is the one which held the voting power. So Mr. DeKoning and his friends were able to maintain their position of power, because if any one else came in, they could put him in one of the other locals, without voting rights.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the junior Senator from Ohio correct in the understanding that unions representing employees in a particular industry can collect dues from all the workers, but preclude certain workers from the rights which should be enjoyed as members?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct—under the union shop contract.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the purpose of the Senator's amendment is to require that when a union is collecting dues from all the workers, it shall accord membership to all the workers, under uniform rules, having recognition of the right to differentiate on the basis of merits in connection with technical work.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What objection has been made by anyone to this type of provision, if there has been objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only objection I have heard to it is that it would endanger the control of certain officers who have a tight control over their organizations at the present time, and would lose such control if the membership were open, with voting rights, on a broader basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then am I to understand that the opposition to this provision is raised by those union leaders who wish to maintain a despotic control over the unions and their operations?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not wish to say to the Senator that that is the only opposition, but I think that is the principal opposition to it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to distill the arguments, with a view of establishing what argument there is against this provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have made the argument for it. We may hear some argument against it—perhaps merely because it has not followed the usual procedures. This amendment may be like those on which we voted yesterday, which the committee has promised to report on June 10 or May 5.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me ask one further question. Does the Senator from California feel that if, on June 10, a bill is presented to the Senate and acted upon within a reasonable time, there will be available in this session of Congress suf-

ficient time in the House to conduct hearings and vote on the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The minority leader personally believes that there will not be sufficient time to explore the broader aspect, if we delay until after mid-June. If the bill is not reported until June 10, with the appropriation bills which we shall have before us, very likely we shall not get to it until July. July may or may not be the last month we shall be in session. I think we would endanger the hope of getting some of these amendments, which most people seem to agree are good, if we were to follow such a course. Those who insist upon that course, for their own reasons—and I have no objection to them—feel that the amendments should go through the process of committee consideration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I voted in support of the Senator's amendments. I did so because I believe that the disclosures by the McClellan committee cry out with great force for the Congress to take appropriate action.

I concluded that while I would like to have the committee hold hearings, in the regular procedure, on the various bills, nevertheless, because of the lapse of time, that is impossible. If we wait until June 10, and wait another 5 or 10 days before the bill is passed upon by the Senate, and send it to the House, where hearings will be desired, the curtain will be down. The play will be over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I concur in the Senator's remarks, notwithstanding the assurances which have been given.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that if we do get a bill out on schedule, if it is acted upon, and if other things do not intervene to obstruct the optimistic and rosy picture which has been presented to the Senate, there will still be no harm in having these amendments in the bill, because if the amendments are in the bill they will go to the House. The House will act on them. Of course, the House might eliminate all the amendments it so desired. But by that time I would hope we would have the other bill before us. If we did not have it before us, this bill, with the amendments which have been proposed, would at least encourage our friends in the other body to give consideration to a broader bill than one merely dealing with health and welfare matters, important as they may be.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a few moments. I feel that I must clear up a matter which was injected into the RECORD while I was absent from the Chamber about an hour ago.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts referred to the senior Senator from Colorado as follows:

The Senator from Colorado and other Senators discussed the bill in so much detail that in seven meetings we have not been able to have a rollcall on one amendment.

I do not wish to be picayunish, or argue about minor details in the RECORD, but in view of the circumstances of the past few days, I think I should make this statement.

One circumstance is that the senior Senator from Colorado, after remaining

practically quiet for 3½ years, exercised the privilege of speaking in behalf of a bill for 4 hours at a time, and was belabored as a filibusterer.

Another circumstance is that, because of a brief 30-second remark to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVIER], in response to something he had said, not on the bill, the senior Senator from Colorado was charged with violating the rules of the Senate. In this connection, the rules of the Senate are violated and have been violated time and time again since that time.

With respect to the minimum wage bill to which the junior Senator from Massachusetts referred, I refer Senators to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 4, page 5440. What actually happened with respect to the minimum-wage legislation was that the main bill was introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon. It was a very complicated and extensive bill. Furthermore, it had written into it a new formula and interpretation of the commerce clause of the Constitution, which would not only have affected the minimum wage, but would have affected every business in the United States. Whether that would have been justified or not is another question. There can be no question that if that bill had been passed it would have affected almost every business in the United States very vitally.

The bill the Senator from Massachusetts offered was not offered until after we had concluded hearings on the bill offered by the Senator from Oregon.

I read from page 5441 of last year's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator from Massachusetts as he introduced the bill. He is certainly privileged to introduce any bill he wants to, but I should like to say that, in my judgment, the introduction of a bill was not necessary. There is pending before the Senate the Morse bill, S. 1267, which I introduced by request in the early part of the session. Any amendment to that bill could have been made in the subcommittee, and a substitute bill was not necessary. I have no particular pride of authorship, but I think it is a remarkable parliamentary procedure when there is pending a bill, the so-called Morse bill, on which hearings have been held and no proposal has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts or any other member of the subcommittee to offer amendments to it, to introduce a new bill on the same subject.

I am accustomed, after 12 years in the Senate, to fighting for liberal legislation with my name on it for a period of time, only to have, at a later date, the objectives of the proposed legislation taken over by other groups in the Senate.

I am interested in final passage of such proposed legislation, rather than who the author may be, but I want to express on the floor of the Senate to the Senator from Massachusetts my keen disappointment that he did not offer amendments to my bill rather than introduce a bill of his own.

This was answered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who asked the Senator from Oregon to yield to him.

I shall not read all of the Senator's statement; I shall read only the last part of it, as follows:

Secondly, the bill which the Senator from Oregon introduced was presented sometime

before the hearings were held. I stated at that time I felt it would be much better to withhold such a bill until the subcommittee had had the benefit of further hearings. I was a member of the Douglas subcommittee which went into the subject. I felt it would be better to introduce proposed legislation after the subcommittee had had the benefit of further hearings.

It is a fact that we never had any hearings on the Kennedy bill. We did have many meetings of the committee, although I do not know how many. I will say that if ever there was a situation of organized and compounded confusion, it was the situation which existed in the committee at that time.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to one yea-and-nay vote on an amendment with respect to the exemption of certain railroad organizations or situations.

We even had such a ridiculous situation there at one time that, although we had one bill before us, we had a motion of the Senator from New York; I am not sure who made it, but my presumption is that it was his motion, made before I came into the meeting that day. At least we were trying to amend a bill which was not even before the committee, although there was a bill pending before the committee at that time.

There are areas in which there should be some extension of this proposed legislation. I say this particularly to my southern friends. I am not willing to pay the price of extending the interpretation of the commerce clause of the Constitution in order to get a few more people under coverage in this field. I have explained in some great detail in my argument the effect the pending bill would have on the people of this country. I believe implicitly that we have gone as far as we could or should go in putting a Government employee at the side of every person in the United States. My desire, so far as I am concerned, will be to try to get the United States out of a few people's hair and give them a chance to live with a little bit of freedom.

I do not see how we can do it with the extended coverage which was offered in the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The bill offered by the Senator from Massachusetts was not only radically different in the kinds of coverage; it was also radically different in its interpretation of the commerce clause. This was the result which occasioned all of the discussion. I must say that in most instances the Republicans have a pretty good record of being there and attending the meetings of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to comment very briefly on the amendment offered by the Senator from California. However, first I should like to reply to my good friend from Colorado, and say that the pending bill was submitted on August 30, after all hearings had been concluded and after all views had been expressed. Therefore, I am saying to the Senator from Colorado that if the Subcommittee on Labor does not present a bill to the Senate, the Sena-

tor from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has announced that he will move to discharge the committee. If he finds it necessary to do that, I am also going to move to discharge the committee from consideration of the bill on minimum wages. We have been hearing a great deal, for the last 3 days, about the interests of the working people. A minimum wage bill is basically important. It was reported by the subcommittee a year before. We had seven executive sessions, and we have had no progress on it. The Senator from Colorado has been unalterably opposed to it. Therefore, under the circumstances which I have mentioned I will also move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the minimum wage bill, to get it to the floor. In that way we will do something in the interest of the workingman.

I should like to say to the Senate that the amendment of the Senator from California should be defeated. The amendment should also be considered by the subcommittee. What is involved is the rights of an apprentice to vote in elections, whether or not he is paid full union wages. That is involved in the suggestion of the administration with regard to giving the building trades special privileges.

While I agree with the Senator on the signing of the report on the Operating Engineers, I am not prepared to accept the Senator's language without giving it very careful scrutiny as to the effect it would have on the apprentice standards in the labor movement.

Therefore, it would be much better if the amendment were to go to the subcommittee for study. I assure the Senator that we will get a bill on this subject to the floor.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. First I wish to state that I am supporting the amendments offered by the Senator from California. However, with respect to the pending amendment I do not know what its effect would be on the building trades in some cases. It involves working permits in the building trades. I do not know what affect the amendment would have on those permits. I believe in the objective of the amendment, but I would feel much more comfortable if the committee could hold hearings on it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Despite the fact that the Senator was unable to get the minimum wage bill out of the subcommittee, I should like to say, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator misunderstood me. I said out of the full committee.

Mr. PURTELL. Very well; from the full committee. Let me point out that I am a member of the committee and that the Democrats control the committee. I have always voted for the minimum-wage bill. If the Senator feels he has the votes to report such a bill, the committee can report it at any time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me ask the Senator whether he will vote to report the bill which came from the subcommittee.

Mr. PURTELL. I have indicated repeatedly that I want to report a minimum-wage bill from the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. As it is?

Mr. PURTELL. I want to see what the Senator is talking about first. It has been weeks and weeks since the bill was introduced.

Mr. KENNEDY. But the bill has not been changed in that time. Does the Senator have an amendment in mind? All we need is one vote on his side to report the bill.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator has always had my vote in the subcommittee.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is the question we are discussing. Will the Senator from Connecticut vote to report the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. I have indicated that I would vote to report it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Some of the Senator's colleagues have offered a number of amendments. Will the Senator from Connecticut vote against those amendments?

Mr. PURTELL. We have not had a meeting to consider those amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have pointed out that we have had seven executive sessions, and no action has been taken.

Mr. PURTELL. If there are more amendments, of course, I want to have them considered. The Senator from Connecticut has stated repeatedly that he is ready to report the bill. If we have not had hearings on the amendments, we ought to hold them.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am not criticizing the Senator from Connecticut. I am merely saying that so many amendments have been offered, the practical effect has been to filibuster the bill to death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote the junior Senator from Ohio has a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If the senior Senator from Tennessee were present and voting, he would vote "nay;" the junior Senator from Ohio, who would have voted "yea," will abstain from voting.

Mr. IVES (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent because of illness in their families.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] and the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON and Mr. COOPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is necessarily absent and his pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—28

Allott	Curtis	Mundt
Barrett	Dirksen	Purtell
Bennett	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Bridges	Goldwater	Schoepfel
Bush	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Hruska	Watkins
Capehart	Jenner	Wiley
Carlson	Knowland	Williams
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	

NAYS—53

Alken	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Anderson	Javits	Pastore
Beall	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Bible	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Carroll	Kennedy	Proxmire
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Revercomb
Clark	Kuchel	Robertson
Douglas	Langer	Russell
Eastland	Long	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Magnuson	Sparkman
Frear	Malone	Stennis
Fulbright	Mansfield	Symington
Gore	McClellan	Talmadge
Green	McNamara	Thurmond
Hayden	Monroney	Thye
Hill	Morse	Yarborough
Holland	Murray	Young
Humphrey	Neuberger	

NOT VOTING—14

Bricker	Ellender	Kefauver
Byrd	Flanders	Lausche
Chavez	Hennings	Morton
Church	Hoblitzell	Smathers
Cooper	Ives	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "4-24-58-D"—which is the first of the administration's amendments—and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "This" and insert in lieu thereof "Sections 1 through 18 of this".

At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following:

VOTING IN REPRESENTATION ELECTIONS BY EMPLOYEES ON STRIKE

SEC. . Section 9 (c) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by striking out all of the second sentence thereof.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AT 11 A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until Monday next at 11 a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR LANGER'S LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR LANGER ACTS TO AID THE ECONOMY OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Senator WILLIAM LANGER arranged a meeting with the Atomic Energy Commission which resulted in making available to the uraniumiferous lignite fields of the Dakotas a uranium-processing plant.

Senator LANGER arranged a conference of the Congressional delegations from the Northern Plains States and the Great Lakes area regarding an industrial complex which will make great use of the lignite fields with the low-grade iron ores of the Great Lakes area. S. 1058 has been introduced and is presently pending awaiting studies by the Office of Defense Mobilization, Department of the Interior, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Senator LANGER arranged a conference of 20 Senators and introduced S. 809 for the

purpose of providing funds for bringing industry in or near Indian reservations to aid the economy of the Indian people and provide steady jobs. This conference resulted also in preventing the closure of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant which aids the economy of the area surrounding the territory near the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation.

Senator Langer has been working with delegations from the various cities in the State of North Dakota to aid bringing industries to those areas. He played an important part in bringing the airport to the Minot and Grand Forks areas.

Senator Langer aided in the Garrison Dam reclamation and irrigation project which will not only aid the farm lands but will do much for aiding industrial plants being brought to the State of North Dakota.

Senator Langer is a cosponsor of and is fighting for an extension of an additional 4-year period of the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, which act saved the wool growers of America from ruin. The North Dakota Cooperative Wool Growers Association recently at its State convention commended Senator Langer for his full support in fighting for the problems facing the wool growers of America.

Senator Langer has cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 68 to express the sense of the Senate as favoring the acceleration of public works. This resolution passed the Senate last March 12, 1958.

Senator Langer has cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, to express the sense of the Senate as favoring the acceleration of military construction. This resolution passed the Senate March 14, 1958.

Senator Langer cosponsored S. 3462 to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways running west from Michigan, through North Dakota ending in Everett, Wash. It is to be noted that the President has signed into law the recent interstate highway bill which will not only aid the economy of North Dakota but the Nation at large.

Senator Langer introduced a bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Missouri River to determine the advisability of improving the river for navigation between Garrison Dam and Sioux City, Iowa.

SENATOR LANGER AIDS THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN

Of great importance to the people of the State of North Dakota is Senator Langer's long and constant fight for the small-business man of the State of North Dakota and throughout the Nation.

Senator Langer introduced an amendment to a bill which will establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, which states that the administrator shall also designate as a rural development area each State the civilian income from manufacturing of which is less than 50 percent of the average income from manufacturing States of the United States.

Senator Langer has been in constant touch with Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration pertaining to small-business loans for applicants from the State of North Dakota.

Senator Langer has long been known for his fight for the small-business man in the State of North Dakota and the country at large.

As the ranking Republican member of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Senator Langer has been vitally concerned with legislation and investigations which will aid all businessmen, especially the small-business man.

Senator Langer has been in favor of the following legislation:

1. To protect small businesses against ruinous pricecutting.

2. Reducing corporation taxes on the first \$25,000 of taxable income to aid small business.

3. To permit fast tax writeoffs on purchases of used property to \$50,000 value per year.

4. To permit installment payments of estate taxes.

5. To increase insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks up to \$20,000.

6. Urging State legislature to amend State laws that may be an obstacle to Federal small-business loans.

7. To fight for S. 3194, an omnibus small-business legislation, S. 3643, and S. 3651 to create small-business investment companies for the purpose of granting loans to small business more extensively.

8. Senator Langer has urged legislation to slash redtape in small-business stock offerings up to \$500,000.

9. To amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to include within the definition of a small-business concern certain agricultural enterprises.

SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER AND TAX BENEFITS

Senator Langer for many years has fought to reduce certain excise taxes which were enacted into law as war measures back during the World War II period. Senator Langer pointed out that those excise taxes should not be levied during peacetime and that the reduction or abolishing of those excise taxes will be of great benefit to small business and will aid in fighting the recession, will create jobs, reduce unemployment and generally aid the economy of the country.

Senator Langer introduced bills as to the personal exemption (which at one time was \$2,500 and now has been lowered considerably) so that the \$600 exemption may be raised to \$1,000. By raising this exemption, many people in the low- and middle-income groups will be aided and will be a great asset to the small-business man, the laborer, and the farmer.

Senator Langer introduced a bill to permit the schoolteachers to claim as a deduction expenses paid for their further education. Since this bill was introduced, the Internal Revenue Service has issued a regulation which conforms with the provision of the bill.

Senator Langer introduced a bill to prohibit the denial of a deduction as a business expense compensation paid to a dependent of a taxpayer for personal services actually rendered in the taxpayer's trade or business.

Senator Langer introduced an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase exemption for income-tax purposes.

Senator Langer introduced a bill to allow an additional income-tax exemption for a dependent child who is a full-time college student.

Senator Langer introduced legislation to give depletion allowance for sand and gravel operations in the State of North Dakota.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER TO AID PARTICULAR SEGMENTS OF NORTH DAKOTA

1. S. 2825 to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to include within the definition of a small-business concern certain agricultural enterprises.

2. S. 999 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science (Public Law 205, 85th Cong.).

3. S. 212 to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior.

4. Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, that the Congress hereby recognizes the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum as a memorial to individuals who have made out-

standing contributions in the opening and development of the West and as a fitting and valuable institution for the collection and preservation of artifacts and other evidences and data relating to the role the West has played in enriching our American historical heritage.

5. S. 3436, authorizing the appropriation of funds for the purpose of rebuilding a bridge at Cannon Ball, N. Dak.

6. S. 3299, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

7. S. 3189, to modify the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin in order to provide for certain payments to the cities of Mandan and Bismarck, N. Dak.

8. S. 2502, to provide for the establishment of the Geographic Center of the North American Continent National Monument at Rugby, N. Dak.

9. S. 1932, to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

10. S. 585, that the Secretary of the Treasury pay to the Kensal school district in North Dakota school district's claim for reimbursement of loss of revenue resulting from the construction of the James River Reservoir.

11. S. 1556, to grant consent of Congress to States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of the waters of the Little Missouri River and tributaries.

12. S. 1352, to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., Wahpeton, N. Dak.

SENATOR LANGER'S RECORD IN SUPPORT OF FARMERS, THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION, AND THE RURAL TELEPHONE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Langer. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER'S RECORD IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE FROM 1941 TO PRESENT RELATING TO THE FARMERS, REA, AND RTA

1. While in the United States Senate, Senator Langer has consistently fought on the floor of the Senate for legislation and through the executive branch of the Government for administrative action to improve the way of life for the farmer in many ways:

- (a) 100 percent of parity.
- (b) To improve the tax status of the farmer.
- (c) Social security benefits for the farmer and his wife.
- (d) Unemployment compensation for farmers.
- (e) Protection for durum wheat farmers.
- (f) Irrigation and reclamation to aid farm lands. Senator Langer fought to get 1,500,000 acres of North Dakota farm land under irrigation.
- (g) Aid to water resources.
- (h) Soil conservation legislation.
- (i) Rural electrification benefits.
- (j) Federal Deposit Insurance.
- (k) The Bank of North Dakota and its resulting interest rates.
- (l) Rural telephone service.

Senator LANGER introduced a bill providing for adjustment in wheat acreage allotments (Public Law 8, 84th Cong.).

Senator LANGER introduced a bill to provide for a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold (P. L. 820, 80th Cong.).

Senator LANGER introduced a bill which became law to provide wheat marketing quotas for 1956 (Public Law 431, 84th Cong.).

Senator LANGER introduced legislation prohibiting planting or transfer of wheat imported as unfit for human consumption with suitable wheat without notice to the transferee. (Reported favorably by the Senate Agriculture Committee, March 20, 1953.)

Senator LANGER introduced a bill for relief to farmers for agriculture losses due to natural causes. (Passed Senate, April 25, 1955.)

Senator LANGER has pending before the Congress the following bills to aid the farmer:

1. To provide for cancellation of certain seed and feed loans.

2. To establish a national food-allotment program to augment the requirements of needy persons and families, etc.

3. To provide for the conversion of surplus grain owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation into industrial alcohol or for stockpiling purposes.

4. To continue a special-milk program by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools. He has always fought for school-lunch program and recently persuaded the United States Government to provide four carloads of butter to the Indians of North Dakota.

5. To provide a minimum acreage allotment for corn and for other purposes.

6. To provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes.

6a. To provide that certain agricultural enterprises be included within definition of small business.

7. To amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to permit loans insured thereunder to be insured for the full value of the farm, less any prior indebtedness.

8. To extend filing of claims for refund of taxes on gasoline used on farms between January 1 and June 30, 1956.

9. To provide for an improved farm program.

10. To authorize the conveyance to former owners of mineral interests in certain submarginal lands acquired by the United States in North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana.

Senator LANGER has sponsored legislation to create foreign markets for United States agricultural products.

Senator LANGER with Senator YOUNG led a successful and strong fight to get decent payments under the Soil Bank program for North Dakota farmers.

More and more small type, family size farms are leaving the United States scene. Senator LANGER fights to keep the small type, family size farm a part of our American way of life.

REA AND RTA

When Senator LANGER came to the United States Senate in 1940, he found that, of the 48 States, North Dakota with only 6.7 farmers of 100 receiving REA, was at the bottom of the list of farmers having REA. To the east, Minnesota, 40 of every 100 farmers had REA. To the west, Montana, 25 of every 100 farmers had REA.

The State of North Dakota had been completely neglected in the REA program in Washington. As chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, Senator LANGER conducted hearings and called as a chief witness Mr. Claude Wickard, National Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. These hearings revealed that no honest attempt had ever been made to get REA for the farmers of North Dakota.

Mr. Wickard made available Mr. Richard Dell to the North Dakota Senator and 23 public meetings were held in North Dakota. As a result of these meetings, Mr. Dell notified the people of North Dakota that a \$6 million plant would be built at Grand Forks; a new unit would be placed in the coal fields of Mercer County. However, that did not take care of the 35,000 farms in the central portion of the State which were without power.

Upon returning to Washington, this matter was brought to the attention of the Members of Congress and approval was obtained for the building now known as the William J. Neal plant at Verendrye which cost \$9,250,000, with transmission lines costing \$14,400,000—the largest plant using coal as fuel. The significant thing is that the plant will be owned by the cooperatives who are buying it on an amortization plan at 2 percent interest.

The plant was built and is owned by the eight REA cooperatives in the State which, at that time, was headed by Mr. Gerald Olson of Wahpeton. Today, North Dakota has the finest REA system in the United States and it is owned by the users. Also, North Dakota has received an increase of \$111 million in loans for REA, since 1941.

Senator LANGER has fought off attempts of the private electric power interests who want to ruin REA. One of the most successful fights of his senatorial career was the single-handed investigation into the Dixon-Yates deal which was designed to weaken the TVA and REA programs and would have created a devastating blow to the public-power program in the United States.

When the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of which he was chairman was denied funds to operate, the North Dakota Senator used his personal office staff to launch this uphill fight against the Dixon-Yates contract.

The following Congress, when Senator ESTES KEFAUVER assumed the chairmanship of that special subcommittee on the Dixon-Yates contract, both Senator KEFAUVER and Senator LANGER teamed together in revealing sufficient evidence resulting in the United States Government canceling the Dixon-

Yates contract resulting in a tremendous victory for public power and the REA.

Also, there have been strong attempts to increase the interest rates to the REA from the present 2 percent to as high as 4 percent. This attempt too has been bolstered by the private-power companies who have spent millions of dollars advertising all over the United States calling the REA system "socialistic." As a matter of fact every farmer's wife knows that the REA has been a godsend to the farm.

If the interest rates were increased to 4 or 5 percent from the present 2 percent, several million farmers would have to pay almost double the present amount for REA service.

Senator LANGER has introduced several bills directed at the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Power Commission to prohibit the powerful private electric-power companies to charge off as a business deduction on their income taxes the propaganda advertising directed at killing the REA. It is significant that recent regulations by the Internal Revenue Service backs up such requested legislation by the North Dakota Senator.

When the National REA was planning the new building in Washington, Senator LANGER was invited to break the ground for the new building. These ceremonies were televised and considered one of the significant REA events of the year. Senator LANGER has always fought for public power whether it be in the North, South, East, or West.

Last year, against doctors' orders, Senator LANGER returned to the floor of the Senate to vote for S. 555 which he cosponsored providing for the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam. This bill passed the Senate by an extremely close vote and was heralded as a great victory of public power over private electric power. Unfortunately, the bill did not get through the House.

Just as Senator LANGER fought for REA he is fighting constantly for rural telephone systems for the North Dakota farm families. At a banquet in North Dakota, Mr. Claude Wickard once stated to the REA people that "You should remember BILL LANGER every time you turn on the lights." Senator LANGER wishes to have every farmer in North Dakota to be able to pick up a telephone. He feels that the more isolated the farm, the greater is the need for a telephone at hand.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M. MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 28, 1958, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Feeder Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the Easter adjournment, when the

Association of Local and Territorial Airlines was holding its quarterly regional meeting, in Las Vegas, Nev., a member of my committee, the distinguished Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, addressed the association on the timely subject of the successful operation of the Nation's local service and territorial airlines.

It was most fitting that on the day of the Senator's speech, Friday April 11, the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, James R. Durfee,

announced the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to approve its first guaranteed loan to a local service airline, Bonanza Air Lines, Inc. The guaranteed loan bill, which was introduced by the distinguished Chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and was passed during the first session, guarantees the use of new, postwar, turbojet airplanes for these small airlines

at a time when financing is otherwise most difficult.

Because I believe that the address made by my colleague is so timely and definitive of the financial problems of this industry, and that it will be of great interest to all the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech which the distinguished Senator from Nevada made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUCCESSFUL OPERATION OF LOCAL SERVICE AND TERRITORIAL AIRLINES

(Address by Senator BIBLE before Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, Las Vegas, Nev., April 11, 1958)

It was a little over a year ago when I first heard of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, now familiarly known as ALTA. As you know *alta* in Spanish means high, which is altogether fitting for an industry that has given height additional meaning, particularly in the last decade of the 20th century. But as you gentlemen well know, an airline—and particularly a local one—needs more than height to operate successfully.

With this thought in mind, I would like at the beginning of my remarks to dispel a popular misconception that the local airlines are the happy beneficiaries of huge Government subsidies. Only a cursory look at the financial picture of the members of your association will reveal that the small airlines, rather than enjoying great largess from a Government Santa Claus, have in fact found the path to solvency strewn with all sorts of obstacles.

While the service you provided showed tremendous gains from 1946 through 1956, it is astonishing to note that the local service carriers together had an income during that 11-year period of only \$1,850,000—and 9 of the 13 local service carriers accumulated deficits of \$2,192,000.

The total income of \$1,850,000, however, doesn't give the true picture—because 3 out of the 13 carriers received \$1,701,000 of that amount—or 92 percent, while the remaining 10 carriers divided up the remaining 8 percent. It is also noteworthy to point out that during this 11-year period the 13 carriers realized a rate of return of only 1.43 percent on their investment.

Thus it will be seen that the claim sometimes heard that the Civil Aeronautics Board "guarantees" the local service carriers a return of 8 percent on their investment is without foundation in fact. There are 2 factors which prevent the realization of an 8-percent return:

1. If the Board's rate is established for a future, or closed period, the actual operational experience may turn out to be substantially different from that forecast by the Board; and

2. If the Board's rate determination, including its theoretical rate of return, is made for a past, or open period, the Board makes arbitrary determinations of what the carrier's expense levels should have been, thus substituting its own hindsight for the carrier's business judgment, which is necessary based upon facts at hand at the time of the decision.

The Government has never paid one dollar of subsidy for the private benefit of a local service carrier or its stockholders. On the contrary, the sole purpose of subsidy is to benefit the public, and that policy is so spelled out in the Civil Aeronautics Act.

In a recent decision, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, commented on this aspect in the following terms:

"The objective of the Congress is plain. It is the maintenance and continued de-

velopment of air transportation to the extent and of the quality required for the national commerce, postal service, and defense. The objective is on a grand scale. It is for the public interest. It is vital. The words used are important, because they depict with clarity a Congressional policy. Moreover, the payment is to enable such air carrier to maintain and continue the development of air transportation. Congress did not put the responsibility for development of an air transportation system wholly upon Government agencies. In this statute the Congress sought to utilize the abilities and capacities of the private air carriers. The purpose of the compensation is to enable the carriers to maintain and continue the development."

The court continued, and I quote, "The need which the statute seeks to meet is not the need of the carrier for funds for its own private purposes, for its own operation or profit. It is the need of the carrier for funds to enable such carrier to carry on for the purposes depicted by the Congress in the interest of the Nation."

If responsible Members of Congress take a sympathetic view of the plight of the local service airlines it is only the natural reaction born of a desire to be fair. It is my own view that our Government has, on many occasions, dragged its feet, in considering affirmative steps to assist these airlines in remaining aloft in a financial climate that is not perpetually soaked in.

Without in any way wishing to deprecate a policy of neighborliness to our foreign friends, it does seem appropriate to point out, however, that the United States Export-Import Bank has, since its founding in 1934 to March of this year, extended loans to foreign airlines, for the purchase of airplanes in this country, the staggering total of \$154,645,000. This undoubtedly is good business and sound policy, but I cannot help but reflect that if similar generosity had been bestowed upon our local carriers there would today be not only profits but, miracles of miracles, actual dividends.

This is not a case of charity beginning at home, because the local service airlines do not want a handout; they want only the opportunity to provide optimum service with the reasonable expectation of a return on their investment.

The great social and economic strides made by America's smaller communities in recent years can be traced in large measure to the advent of feeder airlines. This convenient, speedy method of transportation broke the back of isolation which had been thrust upon these cities in former years.

Dedicated to and specializing in service to the smaller communities of the Nation, these carriers have opened new industrial vistas which have contributed greatly to a continuing growth and development. This ready accessibility of air travel has encouraged a decentralization of industry from the big metropolitan centers to the outlying areas. Your airlines have tied these small communities to their major trading centers and at the same time have brought about a broader based economy that benefits everyone.

Although these airlines have more than a decade of solid achievement behind them, I believe that the real development of local air service lies ahead, provided the necessary stimulus is provided on the national level. It is my hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will continue to lend encouragement and support to the industry and will examine and reexamine the needs of the smaller communities for air transportation. There should be no faltering until the ultimate goal is reached—and that goal is a nationwide network of airlines dedicated to local service.

In striving toward this objective, it should be made crystal clear that the airlines are going to need continual financial assistance

during the period of expansion and introduction of new equipment to replace those old, dependable—but certainly outmoded—DC-3's.

In the future, it is my hope and I know that it is your hope, that this investment will result in service to a network of small communities by small carriers who are not dependent upon Government support.

The prospects for this eventual situation are based on two facts:

1. The local service carriers will be able to acquire aircraft with lower seat-mile cost and greater passenger attractiveness, and

2. The estimated revenue increases with more efficient equipment offer every promise of reducing subsidy requirements at least after the initial stages of operation, together with a further liberalization of operating restrictions.

A frontal attack on the three road blocks to profitable operation—lack of modern equipment, and unrealistic route structure, and a Jenny-type rate of return method—will make the difference between harrowing operations and smoothly performing efficiency.

Congress has taken a forward step in passing legislation to allow air carriers to reinvest gains derived from the sale of flight equipment in the purchase of new equipment to meet the pressing needs of the times. As you men know, under previous decisions and regulations of the CAB, a subsidized carrier faced the dismal prospect of having any capital gains, realized from the sale of equipment, applied as an offset to reduce the subsidy to which it was otherwise entitled. Certainly such an inflexible and unjust rule could only work to the detriment of the carriers and to the general public as well. With passage of this remedial legislation by both Houses of Congress, it appears that another hurdle has been removed from the path of aviation progress.

When I learned of ALTA's founding in February of 1957, my first thought was to wonder if there was justification for another airline association in Washington. But it was not long before I realized that you had an important mission to fill, and as a starter you undertook the support of the Government guaranty loan legislation. I would like to take this means of congratulating you as an association, and Col. Joe Adams as your executive director, for the splendid manner in which you presented your case in behalf of that bill. As acting subcommittee chairman in the Senate, I heard several of you testify. I asked many questions as I wanted to develop a complete record. It was that record—comprised mainly of your testimony—that gave momentum to the bill on its way to final passage.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, as you know, had proposed that legislation and it is to be commended for the vigor with which it supported its enactment—despite unfavorable reports from the Departments of Commerce and Treasury, submitted under the blessing of the Bureau of the Budget. I can only add the hope that the CAB will continue in a policy of enlightenment to foster sound economic conditions throughout your industry.

Chairman Durfee has stated that the local service airlines need the boost of continued appropriations of subsidies, and he is as right as rain. It is certainly a grim paradox that despite a subsidy of more than one-third of total operating revenues, net losses are still the order of the day.

There are no easy answers to the problem, but there is a course of action that can lead to an eventual solution. This will require the teamwork of the administration, the Congress, the CAB, and each and every local service carrier.

Congress has given official recognition to the Nation's policy on civil aviation in a concurrent resolution which I introduced during this session. The resolution takes

note of the 20th anniversary of enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, one of the sponsors being my predecessor, the late Senator Pat McCarran, who was known as the father of civil aviation. The resolution commends both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration for their sound stewardship of the act and its objectives, and urges adherence to policies which will enable civil aviation to solve its present economic and technical problems and assure the public of the benefits of a strong air transport system and civil aviation industry.

The general public should be the prime consideration in any legislation designed to strengthen the airlines industry. If you people are hamstrung by capricious regulations, if you are prohibited from operating profitably. The public will suffer in being denied the kind of service to which it is entitled and expects.

So I say to you in conclusion: set your sights to the goal ahead, continue your good work of providing the best possible service, state your case clearly and forcefully on a solid basis of facts—and it will pay off richly in terms of a more understanding Government, greater operating efficiency, a sound route structure, and—most important—a self-supporting industry.

Thank you.

Tenth Anniversary of Independence of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

MR. MARTIN OF IOWA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered before the B'nai Israel Congregation, Washington, D. C., Friday evening, April 25, 1958, at a service commemorating the 10th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREAT MOMENT IN HISTORY

(Address by Senator THOS. E. MARTIN, of Iowa, before the B'nai Israel Congregation, Washington, D. C., April 25, 1958)

It is indeed an honor and a privilege, ladies and gentlemen, to be invited to address the B'nai Israel Congregation on such an occasion as the 10th anniversary of the establishment of a new nation in which you have such a vital interest. Many of you, I am sure, have relatives or dear friends in Israel. Many of you have tolled and sacrificed to help Israel become an established sovereign state and win acceptance as a full-fledged member of the community of nations. And I am sure that in expressing my own personal best wishes and hopes for the continued growth and development of Israel as a full-fledged nation, I am bespeaking the thoughts firmly fixed in the minds of all of you.

There is much justification, ladies and gentlemen, for comparing Israel's first decade of existence with the early days of our own United States of America. Both achieved their independence by struggle, by a pioneering determination to maintain that independence and freedom, by what a great wartime leader described graphically as "blood, sweat, and tears." It was exactly because of

these common facets of origination, I am sure, that the United States so promptly reached out a helping hand 10 years ago, to give a lift to the then brand new nation of Israel, and has kept that hand busy with various forms of aid and assistance during the subsequent decade.

I personally visited the Holy Land in 1945, before it became the sovereign nation of Israel. Then, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, on an inspection tour of United States military installations, I made a special trip to what is now Israel. While in Tel Aviv I was impressed, during my too-brief stay, by the newness and cleanliness of that city, and by the energy and industry of the Jewish people who already were building it up in anticipation of the independence which they felt certain they would soon win. So, while I have never visited the independent nation of Israel, I have seen its lands and I have seen the devotion and energy of the people who now proudly call themselves Israelis.

My point in mentioning this is that even having visited the land, I still find it difficult to conjure in my own mind a mental image of the trials and tribulations and hardships which the Israeli people must have encountered in setting up their new nation, and in trying to create in it a stable government and a stable economy. The necessity for simultaneously defending its territory against incursion from neighboring countries most assuredly has not simplified those problems.

But if I have such difficulties, I know it is infinitely more difficult for those millions of Americans who never have had an opportunity to visit any part of Israel, to picture to themselves the proud struggle and fight of that country's people to solidify their independence and to improve their national status. I think perhaps that is one reason why our American policies to help Israel arouse some opposition within our own country. We know, from reading our own history books, that we needed help from other countries to win our battle for independence, and then to solidify our independent status. We should know that if we desire to see an independent Israel, as I am sure the preponderant majority of us do, we must, as an established leader of nations, give it an occasional helping hand.

There is another point of valid comparison between the United States and Israel. We Americans proudly call our country the melting pot of all nations. Our people have come from all parts of the world; perhaps not those of us who today are Americans, but certainly our ancestors did in years gone by. But if the United States has merited the "melting-pot" description, as it assuredly has, Israel assuredly merits the same description. Some of its people arrived originally as refugees from the barbaric terrorism of Hitlerism or of communism. Others came from other parts of Europe, from Africa, from the Middle East, from the United States and other parts of the Western Hemisphere. On a percentage basis, this migration has boosted Israel's population more in its 10 years of existence than any other comparable population growth in any nation in history.

When Israel became an independent nation on May 14, 1948, it had a population of 650,000. Today its population is slightly more than 2 million. Considering the barren, desolate character of its land at the start, it is truly amazing that Israel has been able to absorb this 200-percent growth in the relatively brief span of 10 years. And this in a land comprising slightly over 8,000 largely arid square miles—roughly the area of our State of Massachusetts, and about one-seventh the area of my own State of Iowa, which has a population of a little under 3 million people.

Against this background, and particularly in view of the important sums Israel has

been compelled to spend to maintain her military defenses, it is to be expected that she would be experiencing economic difficulties. The surprising thing probably is that she is making such major strides toward a stable and self-sufficient economy. Israel still is existing to a major degree on goods and materials from other countries, but her own domestic production is increasing markedly and her exports are becoming an important factor in paying for the goods imported from other countries. Her exports in 1957, for instance, had a total value of \$135 million, of which \$20 million worth came to the United States. The figures may seem small by comparison with overall world trade figures; but they are very significant in the light of the fact that during the first few years of Israel's existence, her exports were almost nonexistent. She had nothing to export then; everything she could produce went to the use of her own people, and brandnew industries and trades had to be established to produce enough extra goods so that measurable quantities could be shipped abroad.

The country still has a long way to go but it is making important strides. Her \$135 million of exports last year were only about one-third of the \$404 million worth of materials she imported; but it was more than twice the \$59 million value of her exports only 4 years earlier, in 1953. Also significant is the fact that Israel now is able to make a serious bid for many facets of our own American markets, having sent \$20 million worth of goods to this country last year. There is good reason to believe that this figure will increase substantially this year.

Israel has boosted its agricultural production several times by irrigating what used to be desert wastelands and by introducing modern concepts of farming. It has introduced industry to its urban centers in the form of hundreds of small factories and plants producing a broad gamut of goods, outstripping its Arab neighbors in becoming the industrial center of the Middle East. Its production of electrical energy, for example, has more than quadrupled since 1949. All of this, of course, is why Israel's exports are becoming an important factor in her economy.

Israel's troubles and difficulties would have been bad enough, if they had involved only the economic problems created by establishing 2 million people in a land which previously had barely supported only a few hundred thousand. But these, as we all know, were only a small part of her troubles. Superimposed on top of them was the problem of defending Israel itself against a ring of bitterly and openly hostile enemies who were admittedly bent on stamping out the new nation's existence; who sought to conquer it militarily, and, by refusing to have any trade or other relations, to kill it economically.

It was this violent antagonism of the Arab countries which not only threatened the very existence of Israel from the outset, but made things so extremely difficult for the Free World nations, including the United States, which had sponsored Israel's freedom and were trying to help it gain international acceptance as an established sovereign state. For us, it created the problem of preventing a new and struggling nation from being overrun, but without alienating the Arab nations to the point where they would fall into the Communist camp by default. Blind and unreasoning hatred, such as was felt by some of the Arab countries, is difficult if not impossible to reason with; despite all our efforts that part of the Arab world which follows the dictatorial prejudices and vagaries of Egypt's Gamal Nasser still is as blindly unreasoning in its hatred for Israel as ever, and by now has fallen under Communist influence, although maintaining a pretense of independence.

The violence and terrorism which has been such an integral part of the growth of Israel as a nation is, of course, nothing new to the Jewish people. Violence and terrorism have been part of their history through the centuries, even to modern times; thousands upon thousands of present Israelis who have fought or aided innumerable battles in defense of their new homeland in the past 10 years were brought up in the tradition of Polish ghettos, of pogroms, of fiendish Nazi tortures. Establishment of a Jewish state in the Holy Land long had been a dream of millions of Zionists around the world who hoped to escape such violence; but the opposition was strong, the path toward its creation was studded with obstacles. Not until that historic day in May of 1948 was the dream of a Jewish state to become reality—and then it was a reality in which violence still could not be avoided.

In the April 1958, issue of the *Hadassah Newsletter*, is an interesting article by Cecil Roth, noted educator and historian and reader in Jewish studies at England's Oxford University, entitled "The State and World Jewry." One point made by Mr. Roth struck me particularly as most pertinent.

Before 1948, the article noted, there was a worldwide acceptance of the concept of a Jew as, and I quote Mr. Roth's article, "Intellectual, but unable to do things with his hands, unless it were with a needle; incapable of hard physical labor; and generally timid, unmilitary, and unsoldierlike." But in 1948, with the birth of the new nation, and I quote Mr. Roth again, "suddenly a new Jew forced himself on the attention of the western world; no less intellectual, perhaps, than before, but capable of and delighting in physical labor of the most exacting sort, and at the same time showing himself a superb fighting man." His characterization of the new Jew is so true. Only persons "capable of and delighting in physical labor of the most exacting sort" could have stuck it out in the nation and survived its initial years; any persons lacking those qualifications would have failed to survive, or would have tossed in the towel and migrated on to other lands. For it was in Israel, an era of toil and physical labor—hard, uncompromising, sweat-producing physical labor of the most exacting sort. As for the fighting qualities of the Israeli people, no one any longer can doubt them in the least. Whenever any nation with a population of only 2 million persons of all ages and conditions, can

hold at bay and instill deathly fear in a surrounding ring of antagonistic neighbors whose populations total many, many times that number, none can doubt the fighting qualities and love of homeland of the 2 million. And it should be noted that Israel's heaviest defensive fighting occurred during its first year of being, when its population totalled less than 1 million people, not the 2 million of today, which makes the accomplishment even more notable.

There are those who decry these military accomplishments of the fledgling State of Israel, on grounds they demonstrate its aggressive nature. This argument I cannot accept. Had Israel not been willing to take up the gauntlet thrown down by its neighbors, and defend its people and its land against open hostility, I am confident there would have been no Israel today. There have been occasions when, I think, all of us would admit that the attitude of the Government of Israel has bordered on the truculent, perhaps on the obdurate. But I wonder what any American would have done under comparable circumstances. Again, it is difficult for persons living in this country to conceive of the difficult situation of those living in Israel. But if I may be permitted a flight of fancy, just suppose that Canada and Mexico were bigger, and more powerful on paper, at least, than the United States, and suppose that, in this imaginary case, Canada and Mexico openly proclaimed their hatred for the United States, and made known their intention of destroying the United States. Such a circumstance, of course, is sheer fantasy, and could never happen other than in a fanciful, hypothetical case. But hypothetical as it may be, if such a thing were to happen, I am sure we in the United States would become fully as truculent and obdurate in our attitude toward our neighbors, as Israel is today toward its neighbors.

The 5,000 Israelis who gave their lives in fighting to defend their new homeland during its first year of existence were imbued with the same love of country and deep desire for independent freedom as were our own American forefathers who gave their lives to prevent another foreign power from reestablishing its dominion over our American lands. It is that same love of country and yearning for independent freedom, that has caused leaders of the Israel Government to maintain an always-prepared, ready-for anything attitude toward its Arab neighbors.

Israel, of course, has had its hotheads and its terrorists, such as those who a few days after the country had attained its independence, slew the United Nations mediator for Palestine, Count Folke Bernadotte; but those hotheads and terrorists are only a small minority, and their extravagances are as distasteful to the responsible leaders of Israel as they are to the rest of the peace-loving world. And those leaders, I am sure, desire peace and amity with their fellowman as earnestly and as deeply as do we who are convinced that the most effective way to maintain peace in this troubled world is to keep ourselves armed and strong enough to fight off any Communist aggression.

No discussion of Israel and its first 10 years would be complete without at least a word of tribute to the dogged determination, the perseverance, and the indomitable courage of the valiant leaders who helped to bring about its establishment as a nation and who have played major parts in steering it through the hazardous path of its first decade. Foremost in the public eye, undoubtedly, was the gallant Chaim Weizmann, the Russian-born British research chemist who as early as 1917 was instrumental in persuading the British Government to proclaim the famous Balfour Declaration, setting forth that country's objective of having Palestine established as a national home for the Jewish people, and who lived not only to see his dream of an Israel nation become reality but to become its first President. Nor can any historian overlook the scholarly, venerable David Ben-Gurion, who like Weizmann was born in Russia but as a young man migrated directly to Palestine—the Ben-Gurion, now 71, who as Prime Minister, has charted Israel's course ever since it became a nation, save for one brief period of retirement. There are many others who also should be mentioned, for their contributions both before and since Israel's establishment. Most of you perhaps are more familiar with their names and their achievements than I; suffice it to say that without their contributions, Israel today might not be.

Israel is highly deserving of the good will and support our country has extended, and of the encouragement it has received from our people. I am sure the preponderant majority of Americans would join me in predicting, for Israel, a bright and permanent future and the early attainment of its goal of a real position of power and influence in the family of nations.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1958

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who commandest the morning, into Thy hands we commit our wills and our work, in calm confidence that Thou art in the shadows and, behind them, working out Thy purposes for mankind, Thy children. Day by day set our feet on the shining path of righteous duty and selfless service.

In these days wherein the souls of men are sorely tried, when so much is demanded of those who would serve the present age, grant to this body of governance strength and grace, that they may prove worthy of every trust the Nation has committed to their hands, as on the anvil of vast issues there slowly is hammered into shape the new and better world that is to be: In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1958.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 26, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1031) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain four units of the Greater Wenatchee division, Chief Joseph project, Washington, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance and the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CORRECTIONS OF THE RECORD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to request the making of some corrections in the RECORD of Saturday, April 26. I wish it understood that I know the Official Reporters are in no way to blame for the errors.